CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

Nos. 1 & 2. APRIL, 1936. Vol. XXVI.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Silver Jubilee of the *Modern Churchman.*

Twenty-five years ago (April, 1911) the first issue of the *Modern Churchman* was published. The magazine came into existence to form a point of contact between isolated Modernists, or Liberals, as they called themselves in those days, and to promote the ideals of truth, freedom and comprehensiveness in the Church of England. At that time the Church, as on many former occasions, was at the parting of the ways, and in the truest interests of the national character and welfare it was supremely important that every effort should be made to assist the Church to take the right road, however difficult, dangerous and distasteful that right road might seem to be to many of her practising members. Then, as now, we have been conscious of the existence of that large body of Church people in this land and in the British Dominions beyond the seas who, for various reasons, are not practising members of the Church, but to whom nevertheless the Church owes a duty of service and influence which she is always tempted to neglect or even to renounce. It was this conviction of the duty of the *ecclesia gentis Anglorum* to the nation as a whole (and not to the rapidly diminishing element in that nation of practising Churchmen) which was mainly instrumental in prompting our undertaking. Our experience, both in the Colonies and in England, seemed to indicate that in a number

of cases many members of this great multitude could be won to friendlier feelings towards the Church, and some measure of practising Churchmanship, if only the Church itself could be changed; and changed in such a way as to make her not less Christian, but more Christian. It seemed to us that the Church of England, in her temper and policy, needed to be far less ecclesiastical, dogmatic and traditionalist in her estimate, both of the nature of the Christian religion and of her own constitution and functions.

The Need of a Re-birth of the English Church.

It seemed to us that in order to become effective, as the spiritual and moral organ of the English race, our Church needed a re-birth, a changed outlook, a re-valuation of her essentials; and that this would be achieved by greater loyalty to the principles of Jesus which underlie His precepts, and also by an awakened consciousness of the progressive character of the unveiling of truth by the Holy Spirit in the modern world.

Without depreciating the value of our traditionalist formularies for the various ages in the past, which had created them, we were compelled to acknowledge their inadequacy and unsuitability for modern use, unless it were frankly permitted to interpret them freely. The prevailing insistence at that time on their literal acceptance as a condition of loyal membership in the National Church, and by all who desired to do pastoral work, seemed, in the light of our modern knowledge and experience, a sin against the very nature of the Christian religion itself. It was here that, it seemed to us, the parting of the ways between Traditionalism and Modernism was most clearly visible.

Traditionalist and Modernist.

The Traditionalist's conception of the Christian Faith seemed at that time to be restricted to the literalist acceptance and interpretation of traditional formularies — a 'form of sound words' handed down from the past and never to be modified through all succeeding ages of the Church's history. For Modernists it seemed that the Christian Faith really consisted in the re-creation in ourselves and in our fellow-men of that attitude to the Divine Father and to mankind and towards the vary-

ing conditions of our environment, which was to be found in the personality, teaching and mission of Jesus Christ Himself. It seemed to Modernists that it was an impossible task in most cases to get modern English men and women to accept the Christian Faith in the traditionalist and literalist form for which ecclesiastical dogmatism was contending, and not only impossible, but not even of the greatest value, could it be achieved.

Bishop Westcott, to whom, next to F. D. Maurice, the Church of England is so greatly indebted for his prophetic teaching, declared that 'Truth comes through life, not through logic.' And if this be so, and all our modern scientific progress supports that view, then truth itself, in the sphere of religion and ethics, is not a matter of verbal affirmations and literalist interpretations of dogmatic formularies, but a method of living, a realization of moral and spiritual experience.

The replacing of the dogmatic conception of the Christian religion by its psychological interpretation appeared to us to be a matter of urgent necessity. After all, the earliest name of the Christian religion was the Way, the Way of Life; and our Saviour had prescribed no test of loyalty consisting of verbal declarations and intellectual affirmations. His test was the test of obedience, of character, of conduct, of spirit and temper: 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' To promote in the modern world the Christian Faith in this modernist form, seemed to us, not only possible but of the very highest value for every side of modern life.

New Truth and its Significance for Christianity.

The whole trend of our modern studies, whether in the spheres of science or history or literary criticism, seemed to demand the modernist conception of the Christian religion. Dogma after dogma in the traditional theological system was being undermined or pulverized. The pseudo-intellectualism which would strive to convince men of the literal truth of the dogmas so discredited was plainly engaged in a hopeless task; and yet, amid the fall of the crumbling dogmatic edifice, there were being revealed the true and eternal foundations upon which the Christian Faith rests and upon which it must build. As in the days when the *Epistle to the Hebrews* was written, the message of

hope amid destruction could be heard : 'Yet once more I shake not the earth only but the heavens also . . . that the things which cannot be shaken may remain' (Heb. xii, 26, 27). It was thus clear that a revelation of Divine Truth of supreme value to the Christian Church was being made through our modern studies and researches, and that a sound knowledge of the nature of these studies and of the import of their achievements ought to constitute an important element in the education of Christian teachers, which would lead them to distinguish between the false and the true, the permanent and the transitory, the essential and the non-essential in traditional Christianity. Christian teachers, thus enlightened, might be enabled with growing insight and power to achieve the re-birth of the Christian religion in a modern society which was rapidly ceasing to believe in that religion.

This obvious and necessary conviction was not welcomed in Church circles. This lack of ready acceptance ought not to have surprised those who have studied either the history of the prophets of Israel or the life of our Saviour and St. Paul. The departure from traditional ways of religious thinking and feeling is a very difficult and costly proceeding. 'New truth makes ancient good uncouth.' At first sight it seems even to make ancient truth untrue, but this is not the case. What it really does is to remove the feeling of comfortable assurance and create a sense of *malaise* and irritation; the result of the lack of right adjustment between old truth and new truth.

Religion, in one of its aspects, is the most conservative thing in human society, and in another of its aspects it is the most revolutionary thing in human society. And in the Christian religion, the highest and most potent form of religion which has yet manifested itself in human history, these aspects are found exemplified, and in frequent opposition. Nevertheless, as it was predicted of Esau and Jacob, 'the elder shall serve the younger.' The Christian Traditionalist, though the struggle be hard and long, has in the end to yield to the Christian Modernist, unless the Christian religion is to expire and give place to a new religion.

'Truth,' said Francis Bacon, 'is the child of time,' which means that truth itself increases in volume and range, in accur-

acy and insight, with the progress of human history. Of course such a view will seem to many of our decadent post-War pessimists to smack of Tudor and Victorian optimism. No poetic product of our post-war pessimism could feel anything but contempt for Tennyson's confession:

> '. . . I hold that through the ages
> An increasing purpose runs
> And the thoughts of men are widened
> With the circle of the suns.'

This must seem to our neo-pagans as false as its companion-sentiment:

> 'I hold it truth with him who sings
> To one clear harp in divers tones
> That men may rise on stepping stones
> Of their dead selves, to higher things.'

Nevertheless this optimistic belief in the reality of truth, the value of truth, and the advance of truth, is one of the characteristics of the Modernist Gospel; as is the conviction that human nature is redeemable, and capable of infinite moral and spiritual progress.

The Modernist is an optimist and is not ashamed to be so. He believes, not only in the conservation of moral and spiritual values in the creative process, but also in the augmentation of these values. He is enabled to hold this conviction, not only because he believed in the goodness and wisdom of the Creator but also because he takes an evolutionary view of the creative process, and that view is a very long one. 'Weak men are for hastening things' said John Milton, and short-sighted men miss the inspiration which is derived from far-reaching vision. Human weakness and short-sightedness, rather than the essential constitution of the universe, are the causes of pessimism.

Nevertheless, the Modernist recognizes the painful character of truth, but he confidently believes that truth heals the wounds she gives; that truth is a needful factor in all progress whether that progress be in the spheres of science, politics, or religion. But these convictions about truth, difficult enough to maintain in a world in which superstition and error often masquerade as sacred truth, are not the only convictions that lie at the root of the Modernist Gospel.

THE MODERNIST'S FAITH IN FREEDOM.

Not less fundamental is the Modernist's faith in freedom, whether in the face of a scientific mechanistic determinism or in the face of political and social tyranny or in the face of ecclesiastical fanaticism and intolerance. St. Paul speaking as a Christian claimed: 'With freedom did Christ set us free,' and that Christians are 'children, not of the bondwoman but of the free woman,' and that 'the Jerusalem which is from above is free, which is the Mother of us all.' Wherever and whenever the Christian religion has been true to itself the Spirit of Freedom has been its characteristic, and if Francis Bacon was correct, as the long stretches of human history prove he has been, in asserting that truth is the child of time, it is no less true to assert that truth is the child of freedom.

Where there is freedom neither of research nor of utterance, neither of adventure nor of experience, truth inevitably declines. The Modernist is well aware of the possibilities of the gross misuse of freedom.

> 'Licence they mean when they cry liberty:
> For who loves that must first be wise and good.'

But the practical problem is, not to give freedom to those who are wise and good, but to give freedom to those who it is desirable should become wise and good, and who cannot really become wise and good without freedom. Progress, both in wisdom and virtue, demands freedom as a necessary condition; and the true art of education is, in this atmosphere of freedom, to develop virtue and wisdom. This is, so the Modernist holds, a needful condition for life within the Christian Church, and particularly needful for the efficiency of the Christian teacher if the Christian religion is to extend its influence over the modern world to the benefit of that world. 'Where,' said the late Archbishop Temple, 'the conclusions are prescribed, research is precluded.' It is the Church's failure to stand loyally for truth and freedom with courage and intelligence that is very largely responsible for her weakening influence in the world to-day. The Church finds it so much easier to be static in these essentials, and to be busy and up-to-date in non-essentials.

The Need for a Comprehensive Church.

But there is yet another essential in the Modernist Gospel. It is the spirit of Christian comprehensiveness. We might perhaps use the term catholicity if it had not become debased. Catholicity to-day means just the opposite of comprehensiveness. It is a synonym for exclusiveness, rigidity and conservatism in the Christian religion. The Modernist is convinced that the Christian Church is at the present time too much concerned with its circumference and too little concerned with its centre; too much concerned with preliminary conditions of admission, and too little concerned with the development of the Spirit of Fellowship within, and outside, its membership. If the Church could but emulate the Spirit of Him 'whose centre is everywhere and whose circumference is nowhere' and become a Church whose chief activity is to achieve human contacts of every kind after the example of the Saviour, and maintain them with the conviction that the maintenance of fellowship is an essential condition of vitality and growth. It is fellowship not fanaticism that is needed to promote a re-birth of power in the Christian Church to-day. The Church's schisms are all due to its system of false values. Dogmatism, ecclesiasticism, traditionalism, are the parents of sectarianism. Until it is realized that fellowship is of far more value than these things the Church will become increasingly impotent and inefficient. The nation, as a whole, seems to have a truer sense of Christian values (truth, freedom, comprehensiveness) than does the Christian Church itself, which is wasting its energy and opportunities over artificialities and trivialities — what one has described as 'the comicalities of theologisms.'

The Spirit-bearing Church.

What the Christian Modernist believes to be the root cause of the weakness of the Church in the world to-day is not original sin in human nature, for there is really more original goodness in human nature than there is original sin, but a devastating misapprehension of the nature of the Christian religion. That religion is not primarily a religion of a book, nor a religion of a corporation, nor a religion of sacramental rites, but the religion

of the Spirit, and that Spirit, the Spirit of Faith and Hope and Love; the Spirit of Truth and Freedom and Self-discipline; the Spirit so pre-eminently manifest in the life and teaching of Jesus.

It is this Spirit, the Spirit of the Divine Father, supremely unveiled in the Divine Son, that constitutes the very essence of the Christian religion. All other things which that religion possesses are means, not ends. In the Christian religion, the realm of ends is the realm of the Spirit.

The Christian Church is described in the Christian creeds as One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic. But the Modernist is convinced that there is one descriptive title of supreme importance which is lacking — it is the designation, Spirit-bearing.

The Christian Church, so the New Testament teaches, was created by the Holy Spirit, and all her *charismata*, her gifts and graces, are the endowments of that Spirit. It is the Creator-Spirit which not only created the Church, but by operating through the minds and hearts of the Church's leaders has created her organizations and Scriptures, her Sacraments and ministries, to assist her in her work for mankind. It is the Spirit which is the Church's supreme possession. It is the Spirit of which the Church is the instrument. It is the Spirit which she exists to propagate. When this is realized our attitude towards all Church institutions is modified. These Church institutions lose their static, immutable, permanent character. They may, in accordance with new creeds and new tasks, be modified, supplemented, even replaced. Their glory is not, as St. Paul would say, 'the glory that excelleth.' Their authority is not supreme. They exist as does the Church itself to serve the will of the Spirit. We do not deny that they are needful — the Christian religion needs Scriptures, organizations, ministries, Sacraments, to enable it to exercise its due influence among mankind, but we assert no less emphatically, that they are all secondary.

It is freely charged against the English Modernist that he is merely a Liberal Protestant, and consequently, a religious individualist. This is not the case. The English Modernist believes that no less important than the spiritual character is the social life of the Christian Church. The Modernist believes in the necessity for a Christian Church, he believes that it is his

duty to be a member of that Church, and an active co-operating member, but the spirit of that Church, he holds, ought to be the spirit not of dominance but of fellowship and freedom.

A modern writer mourns for what he has called 'the lost radiance of the Christian religion,' and in no respect is this lost radiance more evident than in the loss of this belief in the Spirit-bearing Church. Until this belief be recovered, and we use the word recovered advisedly, there seems to us to be no hope for the Church's recovery of strength and inspiration and effective influence. Surrender to and co-operation with the Spirit is the secret of the Church's power. Perhaps the text in Holy Scripture which is for the Modernist the most significant of all texts is concerned with the promise of the gift of the Spirit. 'I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. But when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come He shall guide you into all the truth.' The promise is not one of Papal Infallibility, indefeasibly possessed and mechanically transmitted, but a promise of Divine Inspiration dependent for its reception upon the moral and spiritual condition and attitude of the recipient, and the use to which he will put his possession. Belief in the advance of the Christian Church into all truth, under the guidance of the Spirit, is fraught with difficulty for many Christian people. One school of Christians says: 'Stand fast in the old ways, do not move out of them. All the truth the Church ever can need for the Christian life is to be found in the New Testament.' Professor H. B. Swete used to warn his pupils against the 'lure of primitiveness' which he asserted might be as deceptive as the 'lure of mediaevalism.' The static position is not permissible for the Church of the Spirit. The Seer of the *Apocalypse* heard him that sat upon the throne say: 'Behold, I make all things new.' And the Spirit of Renewal (*anakainosis*) is ever engaged in this task where men will co-operate with Him.

The other school of Christians, represented pre-eminently by the Roman Church, does believe in spiritual evolution — the development of Christian doctrines and institutions — but it believes this advance can only be rightly accomplished under the infallible leadership of the Roman Pontiff. All students of Cardinal Newman's famous *Essay on Development* are furnished with many ingenious arguments for this view. We, who are not

Roman Catholics, and who believe in Christian evolution under the impulse and leadership of the Spirit of Christ, have got to answer the difficult question: How can we know whether the advance which is being made is an advance into the truth or an aberration into error? If we do not admit the right of the Roman Pontiff to decide infallibly in this matter, who is to decide for us? Our test, as Modernists, cannot depend upon the assertion, however dogmatic or however fanatical, of any single individual. Self-deceivers are many, and false prophets abound. The Author of our religion provided a test which is not dependent upon the assertions of the individual. It is the test to which we have already referred, the test of character and of conduct: 'By their fruits ye shall know them.'

> 'For forms of faith let ruthless bigots fight,
> His can't be wrong whose life is in the right,'

provides accumulative proof when the life is not that of a single individual but of a religious community surviving from age to age. J. H. Newman was influenced in his choice of Romanism by his reflection on the words of St. Augustine: *Securus judicat orbis terrarum* (The whole world judges with assurance) which he interpreted as the Roman Catholic world. But the real judges are mankind, the whole human race. It falls to it to make the final decision as to whether the Christian Church, or any portion of it, is following the true line of the highest human progress and welfare. *Vox populi vox Dei.*

It is this conviction of the character of the Christian Church and of the Christian religion which fundamentally differentiates the Modernist from the Traditionalist.

Modernism is not a Church Party.

'Modernism,' said Paul Sabatier, 'is neither a party nor a school, but an orientation.' It does not consist, as is popularly supposed, in the acceptance of negations and the assertion of denials, in the sphere of Christian dogma. It consists in something much more radical. Perhaps the late Mrs. Humphry Ward saw Modernism, as far as Churchmen are concerned, in its least alarming and most attractive form.

> 'Modernism is the attempt of the modern spirit, acting religiously, to refashion Christianity, *not outside, but inside the warm limits of the ancient churches,* to secure not a reduced, but a transformed Christianity.'

The charge is freely levelled against Modernism that it is heretical. But those who have made the charge against the Modernist teachers in this country have failed to prove it. Modern students of Christian dogma, at least since the publication of Harnack's great *History of Dogma*, recognize that orthodoxy is not static but evolutionary. Modernist doctrine is of this evolving character. It does not deny the orthodox positions of the past, but it passes beyond them. The bar at which it stands to be judged is not the orthodoxy of the past, but the orthodoxy of the future. Church history shows us that it is not the orthodoxy which develops which is in most danger of becoming heretical, but the orthodoxy which is stationary. As Mark Pattison writes in his *Life* of Milton, 'Divinity which is made to live, necessarily becomes unorthodox'—that is judged by static standards.

Modernism, although to-day the *Modern Churchman* is keeping its Silver Jubilee, is hardly yet at the beginning of its career; and we believe, not least because we hope it, that Christian Modernism has a long way to go, and a way which is, as its opponents would assert, full of difficulty and danger. The Abbot Joachim of Floris, celebrated as a prophet by Dante, in the twelfth century taught in his doctrine of the Eternal Gospel that in Christian history the reign of the Father would be succeeded by the reign of the Son, and the reign of the Son by the reign of the Holy Spirit. The technical theologian will doubtless regard Joachim's prophecy as smacking of Sabellianism and it would no doubt seem Sabellian to men of Tritheistic mind. Nevertheless, his idea was essentially true. The Gospel of the Father and of the Son attains its consummation in the Gospel of the Spirit, for the Christian religion is pre-eminently the religion of the Spirit.

The Modernist Sowers and the Modernist Harvest.

It may be asked, and rightly asked: Is Christian Modernism making any progress in the world to-day? The Spirit of secularism and the secularization of life is steadily advancing whether it be in Russia or Germany or Spain. This is true, and we may add that this is due in our judgment to the failure of the Christian Church to become Modernist. So far as the English-speaking

races are concerned, we believe that the spirit of Modernism is slowly penetrating their Christian denominations, but not as yet to such an extent as to determine their whole policy and action, for they are still divided from each other and value their denominational traditions and institutions above Christian fellowship. It is these persistent sectional separations and differences which are leading many to assert that so far as the future of the Christian Church is concerned the issue is 'either Rome or Chaos.'

This kind of declaration seems to the Modernist to be a false antithesis, for it confuses chaos with lack of liturgical, institutional, and doctrinal uniformity. Where the freedom of the Spirit exists, where the advance into fuller truth is proceeding, there cannot be uniformity. All that is needful is that there should be the unity of fellowship and the order which exists in a well-organized undertaking; where not everyone does the same kind of work in the same way, but all co-operate in their different spheres to promote a common end and that end, not the strengthening and glorification of their own ecclesiastical denomination but the advancement of the Kingdom of God in the world.

In the Church of England we observe the steady development of the Modernist spirit. Many members of what are called the Catholic and the Evangelical parties do not bear the name of Modernist, but are as Modernist as many who do bear that designation. The late Archbishop of Canterbury, as his *Life* shows, made strenuous and courageous endeavours to provide a permanent place for Modernism within the Church of England, and there is good reason to think that he was successful. Nevertheless, the Modernist task is tremendous, and it is mainly educational, and not least in the case of those who are seeking to do pastoral work in the Christian ministry.

Paul Sabatier in his Jowett Lectures, entitled *Les Modernistes*, places on his title page the words of the Psalmist:

> 'They that sow in tears: shall reap in joy. He that now goeth on his way weeping and beareth forth good seed: shall doubtless come again with joy, and bring his sheaves with him.'

Such is the Modernist hope, and as we look out on the world to-day we see that the fields are white already to harvest.

THE CHURCH AND THE VILLAGE

By the Rev. H. G. Mulliner, M.A., Vicar of North Stainley, Ripon.

IN a recent number of *Punch*, there is on one page an article depicting the rustic mentality of the second oldest inhabitant of Sludcombe: on another page is a drawing of a townsman, patronisingly explaining to a farmer that the aeroplane overhead is an autogiro, to which the farmer replies that his son is the pilot. In these two contributions *Punch* faithfully reflects the contrast to be found in any English village to-day between the old and the new. The type of countryman is changing, and village society will inevitably change also. The purpose of this article is to discuss this change with particular reference to the Church of England in the English village. The change can be described, in a phrase, as one from a squirearchic to a communal society. The Church was integral to the squirearchic society. What will be its place in the future communal society?

I.

The squirearchic village of the nineteenth century was a well-defined type of social order: it was hierarchical and marked by a great disparity of wealth and education. In this hierarchy each had his station and his duties, and whether you were squire or farm-hand to know your station and behave in a manner becoming it, was to gain the respect of all. To teach men to live this respectable life was the task of the Church. The children of 'the squire and his relations' were sent to schools presided over by clergy where they learnt the privileges and duties of their station in life, a lesson summed up in the ideal of a Christian gentleman. Meanwhile the parson in the village, probably the nominee of the squire, was teaching the villagers, in church and out of it, their proper stations, with their rights and duties. His teaching had an authority both divine and human, for while he drew support for the social order from Bible and Prayer Book and Hymn Book, he could usually rely on the squire to enforce economic sanctions 'to the punishment of wickedness and vice and to the maintenance of Thy true religion and virtue.' Where, on the contrary, squire and parson fell out, as we are told oc-

curred to some neighbours of Sir Roger de Coverley, then most unseemly incidents might occur.

Thus the village life—with, of course, the admixture of human sin—expressed in practice the teaching of the Church, and the Church was the village in its religious aspect. Religion and life had come together, Church and village were one thing—saving always the recognized 'Dissent.' It is difficult for the modern mind, suffering from dissociations between religion and life, between Church and State, to realize the powerful unity and naturalness of the old squirearchic order. To decry the work of the Church of those days, as merely that of a social educator and moral policeman, is to forget there can be no society—it will be disintegrated by human passions—unless these functions are successfully performed. Here was the Church's relevance. It was no mere devotional club; it not only nurtured in a few persons of all classes a rare excellence of character, but it held the whole society together morally and spiritually; it was the cement of the social structure. The Lord built the house.

II.

The Religion of the Incarnation can have no regret at the fact of its embodiment in a social order. Yet the degree of achievement is the measure of difficulty when the earthly house of this social order is dissolved. And dissolved it is. Only one destructive force need be mentioned, that of taxation, and particularly of death duties. Unless the current of English political life in this century is reversed, this force will not diminish; its devastating effect on the old squirearchy and the village is well known. 'Knowest thou that the Lord will take away thy master from thy head to-day. . . . Yea, I know it; hold ye your peace.'[1] Among the constructive forces which are making the village of the future, there is first the rising standard of living, especially of the farm labourer, who has more wages, more leisure and more independence. Secondly, there is education, the effects of which are beginning to be felt and increase with the raising of the school-age and the opening of senior schools; an indirect advantage from the latter will be proper grading throughout the rural educational system. In a few years the schooling of any farm-hand's child will be as good as the schooling of the gentry

[1] *II Kings* ii, 3.

used to be. Already education has opened the countryman to the influence of newspaper, radio and film. Through these channels the acids of modernity filter through the country. Thirdly, changes in agriculture will also affect the type of countryman. To-day the farmer wishes he knew more science and the farmhand is mastering electricity, while the younger farmer recognizes he must be more of a clerk than his father, else he will be found bankrupt amid the intricacies of the Marketing Acts. These latter schemes also demand a capacity for co-operation not usually associated with the old type of farmer. The National Farmers' Union is busy preaching fellowship.

If it is asked how far these combined forces have already altered the English countryman and the English village, the answer must be somewhat speculative. There are some villages, almost untouched by new ideas, where one can find the solidity, urbanity and charm of the old world, while possibly only a few miles away is another village where the outlines of a new and different social order can be seen. Probably both types are exceptional to-day, and in most villages the old ideas and the new jostle uncomfortably and the generations perplex each other.

III.

What are the characteristics of the new communal village?

(1) The old village was hierarchical; the new village is democratic. Its democracy is not the *doctrinaire* classlessness sometimes found in our Diminions; it is ready to give respect to personal qualities and to constitutional authority, and, in measure, to traditional position. But its moderate levelling spirit approves of a policy which lops the tallest trees with the axe of taxation and encourages the lesser trees with the manure of money and leisure and education. In its social philosophy the pendulum has swung, and the emphasis has moved from men's differences to their resemblances.

(2) In the old village the government, in effect, lay with the squire; in the new village it lies with the Parish Council. The rise of the modern Parish Council dates from the Local Government legislation of the end of the last century. Many parish councils have suffered arrested development due to a passion for keeping down the rates. Others have begun to exercise a paternal authority. Their statutory powers are considerable, and they can

touch village life at nearly every point, and can also by their committee system enlarge their effective personnel until everyone 'who matters' has a share in the government. They, and their officials, are becoming a power to reckon with.

(3) In picturing the new village it seemed helpful to mention first this democratic spirit in social life and village government for the sake of the contrast with the old order. What is actually appearing first and most noticeably is the cultural interest. Cultural is here meant to include a whole range of interests, from competitions for the best dinner for a schoolboy to take to school to discussion about the place of Chorus in Greek Drama. Several organizations, such as the Women's Institute and the Rural Community Councils, have grown up to meet this demand, and County Councils foster it by the Evening Class system. Perhaps village drama, which has now its national organization, lies central to this cultural movement; while giving scope to a wide variety of gifts on stage and off, it combines both practice and theory, both self-expression and team-work, and provides an entry into the emotions, thoughts and manners of other classes, races and generations. This whole cultural movement might seem unworthy of serious attention were it not for those economic, social and educational forces to which reference has been made. This cultural movement is an outstanding and creative characteristic of the new village.

(4) The communal village needs its manners and its morality though its standards be different from those of its predecessor. It is a lack in this respect which gives thoughtful observers anxiety and country clergymen a sense of shortcoming. The lack is threefold. First is the lack of manners, due to the fact that the old moral convictions are no longer held and fundamental moral issues are in debate in the modern village as in the modern town. Secondly, the lack of an effective public opinion. In the old days the law came down from the Sinai of the large houses. To-day, even if there are any gentry who bother with the village, their moral pronouncements are not received uncritically. Yet in the village there may be neither the education nor the judgment nor the moral standards necessary for the formation of a healthy public opinion. Thirdly, and at the root of this, is the absence of an adequate communal consciousness. Too often each lives on his own moral island where he solely pleases him-

self. 'Nobody is anything except as he joins himself to something,' wrote Bosanquet in *What Religion Is*. The villager in this matter fails himself and his society. The communal village can never truly exist until it receives the loyalty of all the villagers, as a school or college receives the loyalty of its members. At present the village excites no loyalties, occasions no delight in common success, no shame in notorious failure. It stands in no danger of a too rigid social discipline.

(5) None of the features of the communal village so far discussed is in the narrow sense religious. Yet all may express the religious spirit, for 'what makes a man a Christian,' Professor Baillie has written,[2] 'is neither his intellectual acceptance of certain ideas nor his conformity to a certain rule, but his possession of a certain Spirit and his participation in a certain Life.' This is worth remembering against a popular tendency to identify Christianity at worst with Churchy-ness and at best with contemplative adoration. Christianity is life and action; the cup of cold water is more than the prayer. The realization of this communal village is a religious crusade. Its democratic spirit is not far from the teaching of the Gospel, nor its search after moral principles far from Him who bade men 'hunger and thirst after righteousness': its increase of culture is worth working for because it makes possible a greater knowledge of God and more glorious acts of worship, both public and private. This village of our prophecy cannot be established at all without an enthusiastic religion. Nor, when it is established, can religion be other than integral to it, for man is not man until he is in communion with God, and to build social life on practical atheism is to build it on delusion. 'Except the Lord build the house, their labour is but lost that build it.' A secret acknowledgement of God by a few individuals is not enough religious basis for the building up of social life. But neither will any religion be good enough which does not commend itself 'to every man's conscience in the sight of God' as the truest and the noblest and the most beautiful our spirits can attain. Religion must express this highest we know of God; nothing else is worthy of God or worshipful for man. If, in moments of bewilderment, men hand over their consciences to their traditions, then they may have Churches but they cease to have the Spirit of Christ in them.

[2] Baillie, *Roots of Religion*, p. 203.

The need of this vital religion is obvious enough, and we may faithfully believe that in His own way and time God will meet this demand of our souls if we learn to co-operate with His will. Whether the National Church of England will provide this religion is a pertinent question and one which touches us deeply.

IV.

There is no doubt of the opportunity which the English countryside presents to our Church. Like other opportunities, it is a fleeting one. Already the leadership in rural matters passes to men who have despaired of all the Churches. Lacking a religious leadership they could respect, and more conscious in themselves of a religious need than of how to meet it, they go forward not without misgiving to the building up of a new social order on a non-religious or, should we say, non-ecclesiastical basis. The consequence of this is not merely that these men are unlikely twenty years hence to invite in on the ground floor those parsons who have left them to bear the burden and heat of the day. The graver consequence, which the Christian conscience cannot avoid, is that this attempt to build a secular society is doomed to ultimate failure; it is a house built on the sand. This places the Church in a position of special responsibility. It is obvious that the Church of England is well equipped for the task of this religious leadership. We have the unrivalled equipment of an officer in nearly every village, whose training makes him usually the best educated man there, whose pay is provided in part or in whole, and whose office carries a traditional prestige. We have incomparable buildings and a close connection with the educational system. This is highly satisfactory, yet the success or failure of our Church will probably turn on considerations outside the scope of this paper. The present government of the Church of England is, like the National Government, largely composed of one party with its extremists in the background, a few men from other parties in the foreground, and the tacit support of a number of non-party people. Known as 'Anglicanism,' its policy has done little to arrest the drift from organized religion, and the willingness of the National Government to sponsor tithe proposals which, in effect, disendow the Church to the extent of £400,000 *per annum*, or thereabouts, is evidence enough of the poor opinion which the ordinary English-

man has of this 'Anglicanism.' While repainting the sign 'Catholic,' this policy has rapidly turned our National Church into one of our religious sects. It has exalted the Communion Service, and the Easter communicants in England in 1934 numbered 2,319,093 in a total population of thirty-seven millions. This 'Anglicanism' seems to have bred a certain ecclesiastical self-consciousness and introspection, manifest in recent Reports, and it has identified the National Church with mere traditionalism in religion and morality. If this policy continues unmodified the place of the Church in the village of the future is likely to be quite unimportant. A new spirit is needed and a new willingness to join the best forces in the nation in the gallant adventure of the 'brave new world.' So long as the nation distrusts the honesty and capacity of the Church, and the Church distrusts the religious genius and moral judgment of the English people, so long shall we have weakness and dissociation of mind and society. However, it is a way with Englishmen to leave a situation until it is almost irretrievable and then with superb genius to take just those steps which, while not leading to any visionary Utopia, stave off disaster. Possibly our ecclesiastical leaders have a special measure of this English quality. In this hope, certain suggestions in the small sphere of immediate rural policy are put forward.

(1) The greatest need, of course, is not for policy but for older country parsons to see visions and the younger to dream dreams. This is a matter for prayer rather than for argument; as is the still rarer gift of the Spirit which translates our dreams into 'the stuff of life.' The country clergy often seem discouraged, and yet perhaps some are doing better than they know. At any rate, it may be profitable for them to ask yet again, What am I here to do? and avoid answering with a *cliché*.

(2) If there is vision, there may be profit also in conferring with each other. There must be much experience to be pooled, in *e.g.* such technical questions as the use of the Discussion Circle to promote that moral debate, to which earlier reference was made, and to promote adult religious education. The changes in village life are modifying the traditional position of the parson, and he who was once virtually the Squire's Chaplain is becoming virtually the Chaplain to the Parish Council — a different and perhaps more difficult position.

(3) There is also profit in conferences with lay leaders of rural life, and possibly there is need of more *liaison* in high places between the leaders of the Church and those movements which are forming the future countryside.

(4) The usual view that any young man of parts and any leader of brilliant gifts *must* be sent to the town needs modifying. Let the country have its share; it will use the men if they know how to be used.

(5) The work of the country parson, as depicted in our argument, is broad and difficult and interesting enough to attract a type of ordinand unmoved by the thought of administering a large town parish and constantly celebrating the sacraments.

(6) Our argument also provides yet one more reason for taking the next steps towards reunion with our English Free Churches, which have played so notable and often so heroic a part in the development of village life. The sanctioning of intercommunion in a large-hearted way would be an appropriate step. The difference between church and chapel in the country is not chiefly theological at all, but a matter of social class and economic pressure. A new co-operation between them is necessary for the well-being of the village and perhaps for the future of Christianity therein.

(7) While the clergy ever have a duty to all parishioners, possibly their deepest wisdom is to pay particular attention to the livelier spirits who are in fact making the new village and its revised moral and religious standards. Even if this should temporarily alienate some of the others, it may be worth while in the end.

For the gate of opportunity opens for the Church and Nation into a broad and spacious land. It is possible, of course, that war or revolution will close the gate in our faces. Putting aside such fears, it is worth emphasizing again that these rural changes are still at an early stage of development, and it is still possible for the whole movement to be guided and helped, inspired and blessed all the way by the Christian Church. If the Church of England can seize this opportunity, it will preserve the continuity of religion for many generations. If it refuses, it will aid the disintegration of our society.

JOHN SCOTT HALDANE

By the Editor.

WITH the death of Dr. Haldane, C.H., F.R.S., there has passed from our terrestrial sphere one who was both a scientist and a philosopher. The combination is unfortunately rare, but yet it is one of immense value. Of course every modern philosopher, worthy of the name, has to make himself acquainted with the methods and results of scientific research and to incorporate them into his philosophical system. This, however, differs from the case of the scientist, the chief purpose of whose life is the increase and practical application of scientific knowledge, who becomes simultaneously a trained philosopher, well acquainted with the history and achievements of philosophical thought, and who from the point of view of science and through his scientific research constructs a philosophical system. This is a rare achievement, but when successfully accomplished it endows the philosophic system so constructed with a power of assurance and a stability of structure which is capable of carrying conviction to that great body of men who are neither scientists nor philosophers, but are in grievous need of compelling convictions and of a practical realization of the meaning of life and its potentialities.

There are obvious disadvantages in the attempt to be both a scientist and a philosopher. Of a well-known figure in the nineteenth century it was satirically said that whilst all the philosophers believed him to be eminent as a scientist, all the scientists believed him to be eminent as a philosopher. Such a jibe could not, however, be launched against Dr. Haldane. He was no sciolist. To his eminence as a scientist his great practical researches — especially in the sphere of respiration — bear record. His quality as a philosophical thinker is enshrined in three treatises. The earliest, a paper, written in conjunction with his brother, the future Lord Chancellor, and contributed to a volume entitled *Essays in Philosophical Criticism*, was published in 1883. The second, *Mechanism, Life and Personality*,

an examination of the mechanistic theory of life and mind (1913), and thirdly *The Philosophy of a Biologist*, published in 1935.

In the sphere of science, Haldane was pre-eminently a biologist, and those who have been fed to the full with the philosophies of mathematically-minded scientists and are perhaps in the uncomfortable mental condition of the poet Gray, who complained, after reading Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, that he felt as if he had had 'a meal of chopped straw,' will perhaps find Dr. Haldane's philosophical reflections both more comprehensible and more nourishing.

Dr. Haldane was profoundly religious, and religious both as a scientist and as a philosopher. To be religious in this way is unusual. There have been great scientists who felt that their only hope of salvation lay in keeping their religion and their science in separate watertight compartments—such were Pasteur and Faraday. Other scientists, like the great T. H. Huxley, although they have shown the keenest interest both in science and in religion, have felt that the conclusions to which science and religion pointed are in hopeless contradiction and have ended by allowing science to occupy the whole field. This was the characteristic attitude of the nineteenth century scientist towards religion. He claimed to be agnostic—he did not know, he could not tell anything about the spiritual world nor his relation to it, and as a practical man he was not concerned with it. Dr. Haldane's practical conclusions were very different. Philosophically he was both a Baconian and a Hegelian. Whilst as a scientist he was compelled to be the rigorous and uncompromising user of scientific methods, he was conscious all the while of the departmental character of this work. He recognized that it consisted in a deliberate process of isolation and abstraction from the whole, for the practical purpose of investigating a particular class of phenomena. It could not possibly explain the universe as a whole or solve the problem of reality. Of such investigations it might be said, *omnia exeunt in mysterium*. Such researches, whilst unveiling a limited aspect of truth, pointed to vast regions of truth unexplored and unknown. Dr. Haldane, in contrast to many modern scientists, perceived early the fallacy of attempting to explain things from below or in terms of their scientific origins. In contrast to the mechanistic biologists Dr.

Haldane was convinced that biological organisms cannot be adequately explained or understood in terms of mechanics, nor rational and moral personalities in terms of biology. The lower can be explained and understood in terms of the higher, but the higher cannot be explained and understood in terms of the lower. Dr. Haldane's fundamental position is summed up by himself in the concluding words of the *Philosophy of a Biologist*:

> 'The real universe is a universe of personality and the manifestation of God, its scientific aspects being only partial interpretations of it, the imperfect nature of which is revealed by philosophical criticism.'

Some will ask: But was Dr. Haldane a Christian philosopher? In his enthralling volume *Mechanism, Life and Personality*, he writes:

> 'Philosophical discussion helps us to realize that on every hand we are surrounded by mysteries to be solved, and points out the paths of further investigation. Except by the combination of painful and accurate observation with equally painful and accurate thought and action, we cannot realize our true existence. This observation, thought, and action must also be the educated observation, thought, and action of personality, and must focus in itself the spiritual inheritance of personality.
>
> 'In personality there is always the element of the here and now. New experience is always, as it were, welling up within it, and gradually taking the form of new truth and new duty. Personality is living, suffering, rejoicing, and working existence. This idea is clearly embodied in the Christian conception of God: and when we try to penetrate through the sensuous mist which blurs that conception we can see that our discussion has brought us very near to it' (p. 135*f*).

But the fullest answer to the question in Dr. Haldane's writings is to be found in a paper on Biology and Religion which he contributed to the Modern Churchmen's Conference held at Oxford in 1924 dealing with The Scientific Approach to Religion. The concluding paragraphs of that paper[1] can leave their readers under as little misapprehension as to the essentially Christian charcter of Dr. Haldane's philosophy, as the story of his life of splendid, practical service can leave no doubt as to the Christian quality of his character.

> 'The Churches cannot afford to be hampered by unintelligible beliefs which are mainly materialistic accretions of Christianity, and which greatly weaken its influence on those who are worth influenc-

[1] *The Modern Churchman*, 1924, Vol. XIV, p. 281.

ing. Religion itself stands on ground which cannot be assailed: it has no use for rickety defences. The story of Jesus and His teaching appeals to all men, and influences them practically, because it touches what is deepest and most real in them. There are many, however, who feel forced to conclude that that teaching was based only on emotional illusion. Hence adequate philosophical or theological support is needed for it. This support should be based on the widest philosophical and scientific knowledge. Any shirking of the questions involved, or cowardly sheltering behind mere traditional authority, is fatal. If I know my countrymen, I know that sooner or later they will cease to tolerate such methods. The true function of a Church is to help men to see reality as a whole and guide their actions accordingly, thus preventing social chaos, intellectual confusion, and artistic decay.

'You are members of the national Church of England, and we are meeting near the spot where one of the greatest leaders of that Church, a man of English yeoman stock, met his end. It is to Latimer that my mind goes back when I appeal for intellectual freedom in the English Church. He stood, not only for social justice and humanity in his country, but also for intellectual freedom. It was not of his own sufferings, or his own soul, that he spoke as he was dying, but of the England he had served so fearlessly, so lovingly, so faithfully, thus finding oneness with God.

'The candle which was lighted in England as Latimer and Ridley perished is still burning.'

MR. A. P. HERBERT'S MARRIAGE BILL

THERE seems little possibility that Mr. A. P. Herbert's Bill will be discussed by the House of Commons this session, and it is most desirable that this interval should be utilized in its full discussion outside the House. The Bill offers a great chance to the Church of England. Hitherto there has been little but blank opposition to all proposals for the reform of our marriage and divorce laws, but now Mr. Herbert, responding to the lead given in Convocation's report last summer on *The Church and Marriage*,[1] offers to the Church what has been well described as a 'new approach' to the problem. As the Bill is backed by Sir Arnold Wilson, M.P., it should make a particular appeal to Modernists.

Most of the Bill is the same as that introduced in 1933 which was based on the recommendations of the Majority Report of the Royal Commission of 1912. But Mr. Herbert has added

[1] *The Church and Marriage*, being the report of the Joint Committees of the Convocations of Canterbury and York. S.P.C.K., 1935.

three new proposals, and it is to these that the attention of religious opinion needs specially to be drawn.

The first of these is Clause 1, which proposes that there shall be no divorce within five years of marriage. All other relief, such as nullity, separation, alimony, custody, is to be available as now. In Resolution 10 the Majority of the Convocation Committee recommended that 'the Church should be ready to give consideration to proposals' for amending the present divorce laws 'provided that any proposed amendment does not tend to make marriage a temporary alliance or to undermine the foundations of family life.' Seeing that under the existing law divorce can, and sometimes is, pronounced within a few months of marriage, the most ardent opponent of divorce must recognize in this proposal a reform which will bring about more Christian conditions. When it is generally realized that, come what may, there will be no divorce for five years after marriage, then we may expect a considerable diminution in reckless and ill-considered marriages.

The second new proposal is contained in Clause 11 which proposes to remove the present (though frequently ignored) legal compulsion upon the clergy of the Church of England to re-marry certain classes of divorced persons (even if the so-called innocent party has only obtained a divorce by the exercise of the judicial discretion, meaning thereby that such party has on his or her own confession committed adultery also), and to relieve them from the necessity of allowing the use of their churches for the re-marriage of both 'innocent' and 'guilty' parties to divorce cases. Modernists will be wise to agree to this as it will perhaps reconcile the extremists of the Anglo-Catholic party to accept Mr. Herbert's Bill. On this issue there is danger of a conflict between Church and State if nothing is done. We must recognize that in the Church of England there is a large body of opinion which is convinced, that for Christians, divorce is not only wrong, but ecclesiastically impossible.[2] At present the clergy of this school are compelled by law to take part

[2] See in particular *The Church, Marriage and Divorce,* published on behalf of the Council of the Church Union, Church Literature Association, 1936. 'A husband can no more cease to be the husband of his wife than a father can cease to be the father of his children,' p. 11.

actively or passively in re-marriage after divorce, though in practice many bishops have intervened to relieve the clergy, but without legal justification. Clause 11 of the new Bill takes this whole question out of the realm of the civil courts and leaves the Church free to decide its own policy. There are dangers in doing so, but there are greater dangers in continuing the present situation.

It is in the third of Mr. Herbert's new proposals that religious opinion should find most cause for rejoicing, and this rejoicing should come from all parties. Clause 10 proposes machinery whereby those whose incomes are under about £10 a week may begin their divorce cases in courts of summary jurisdiction and thus come automatically within the scope of the social services of these courts. These social services are already very good in some courts and already prevent great numbers of marriages from finally breaking down. A Home Office Committee is about to report on the general question of these services and there is little doubt that before long every court of summary jurisdiction will handle cases of matrimonial dispute by modern and humane methods and with the skilled assistance of trained social workers.[1] When these reforms are achieved — and Mr. Herbert's Bill proposes that Clause 10 shall only come into force twelve months after the rest of the Bill becomes law — the same assistance and facilities will be available for those seeking divorce as for those seeking separation or maintenance. The actual machinery proposed in the Bill need not concern us; it has been said that it is too ambitious and that the Divorce Court judges would never approve; if that be so, the machinery can be modified. The vital thing is the principle that those who cannot afford to pay for adequate professional advice shall come, not direct to the High Court where they become merely subjects of a legal decision, but first to courts which have at their disposal services for enquiry and reconciliation. To-day as soon as such a married person decides to seek a divorce, application has to be made to the Poor Persons Department of the Law Society. With the certificate of this Department a solicitor and a barrister are nominated; from beginning to end

[1] This *Report on Social Services* has now been published, price 3/3, post free.

all are concerned merely with the question, 'Can the Petitioner successfully fight the Respondent?' It is nobody's business to approach the situation in any other way; the parties must be kept rigidly apart from the outset. If applications for separation were dealt with in this way in courts of summary jurisdiction, the number of separations would be many times greater than it is now. Experience has shown that vast numbers of matrimonial disputes can be adjusted voluntarily through the friendly agency of social workers at the courts. Surely those who seek the final step of divorce need this help even more than those who merely seek separation. Such social help does not in any way mean a denial of legal rights; the social worker is not a barrier between applicant and court. The essence of conciliation machinery is friendly investigation by consent. The cases where reconciliation is obviously impossible pass on quickly to the court, there to be tested according to law; the others are dealt with at first without any formalities in the hope of finding such solutions as will make the parties no longer desirous of testing their legal rights. If the 'poor persons'' divorce could automatically pass through this sort of social sifting, could we not reasonably expect more Christian conditions? It is greatly to be hoped that all Churchmen, whatever their views about the right and wrong of divorce, will unite in welcoming such a scheme.

Two further quotations may well be made from the Majority Report of last year's Convocation Committee: 'So far as secular legislation is concerned, some provision for dissolving the legal bond is inevitable.' Divorce exists and is not going to be abolished. Secondly, 'Rigid opposition [to all proposals for divorce reform] by the Church may result in an increased unwillingness to listen to its message.' These words come from those who take the Anglo-Catholic view of Christian marriage. Is it not now the task of all Churchmen to help in recasting our marriage and divorce laws so that we can get the nearest practicable approach to the Christian ideal? Mr. Herbert's Bill seems to achieve this.

JESUIT *VERSUS* BENEDICTINE: A STUDY IN JESUIT METHODS

By J. C. Hardwick, M.A., B.Sc.

TWO publications have recently come into my hands, both of great interest. The first is a pamphlet which was on sale for twopence at the great Jesuit church of the Holy Name, Manchester, and is entitled *Teresa Helena Higginson*, published by the Catholic Truth Society of Ireland, and carrying the *Imprimatur* of the Archbishop of Dublin. One or two passages from this interesting little booklet may be quoted:

> 'They knew she (T.H.H.) spent her nights in prayer and, keeping a close watch upon her, were convinced she never ate. Father Snow confirms this last opinion, declaring that, for many years, no food passed her lips but the Blessed Sacrament. He once forbade her to pretend to eat as she sometimes did in order to escape notice, and told her instead to stay away from meals. She did so, but found afterwards that her absence had never been observed and concluded that her guardian angel, to whom she had a special devotion, must have replaced her at table' (p. 9).

Again:

> 'It was in Lent, 1875, that Our Lord rewarded her love by bestowing on her the title of "Spouse of the Crucified," and by conferring on her the sacred *Stigmata*, sealing her body with the marks of His five most Sacred Wounds. . . . Teresa never spoke of this but afterwards she told Father Powell that Our Lord had indeed conferred on her His Sacred Wounds, and that she had begged of Him to remove the outward signs, but to increase, if possible, the pain' (p. 6).

It is clear that this woman was a pathological case and, like so many religious neurotics, the victim of hallucinations. Persons of this 'mythomaniacal' constitution are characterized by credulity, exhibitionism, and a tendency towards deceit. Teresa Higginson had clearly set herself to imitate two famous saints of the Roman Catholic Church—St. Catherine of Siena and St. Marguerite Marie Alacoque. St. Catherine had no food for years save the Blessed Sacrament, though she had no convenient guardian angel to take her form and place at table. Similarly, St. Catherine is 'married' to Jesus; and the present pamphlet contains close parallels to the 'official' story of St. Catherine's betrothal.

St. Marguerite Marie Alacoque was the foundress of the cult of the Sacred Heart. Teresa Higginson, therefore, must seek to found a devotion to the 'Sacred Head':

> 'She describes how Our Lord again and again appeared to her, most often in St. Alexander's church at Bootle, "His Sacred Head radiant as a sea of Light," and impressed upon her His desire that men should pay special honour to His Sacred Head, the Seat of Divine Wisdom. He told her that as, in the old days of Jansenism, He had sought reparation to His Sacred Heart, so now, in this age of intellectual pride and disbelief, He wished atonement to be made to His Sacred Head, for the insults offered to His Wisdom' (p. 17).

It is perhaps unnecessary to add that she could work miracles, or at least miracles were attributed to her. She could fan dead embers into flame by making the sign of the cross over them, and could get St. Joseph to place firewood in an empty cupboard, while, like St. Paul, she 'heard and saw things which it is not given to those who hear them to utter' (p. 12). Teresa Higginson imitates the experiences of the saints, but instead of their spiritual wisdom she pours out trash worthy of a spiritualistic seance.

I must apologise to my readers for inflicting upon them such a quantity of nonsense; but I have done so in order to stress a contrast. The Higginson pamphlet is the type of literature considered quite suitable by the Jesuits in Manchester as spiritual pabulum for the faithful. The stuff is nonsense, but it is the right kind of nonsense, and the Jesuit Fathers collect the public's tuppences by retailing it at the Church of the Holy Name.

Now for the other book. It is *The Spiritual Letters of Dom John Chapman, Fourth Abbot of Downside*, edited with an introduction by Dom Roger Hudleston.[1] This is a book of really outstanding quality, as different from the average book on prayer and the spiritual life as a diamond is from paste. Dom Chapman writes without affectation, without the usual pious *patois*, but simply, straightforwardly, concisely. These letters, written without thought of publication, intended to help those who had sought his advice, are full of the wisdom of a man who has spent his life in religion, whose knowledge of the technique of prayer, and its possibilities, is first-hand. They are both rational and spiritual; these able, wise, lucid letters will bring

[1] Sheed and Ward, 8/6. First published in March, 1935; second edition in August following.

light and help not only to Roman Catholics, but to every type of earnest, seeking Christian.

Many of them are written to persons whose chief need was not to be goaded into making strenuous efforts (as might be the case with many of us), but who rather needed to be urged to 'ease off' and not to worry overmuch over their failures to reach the goal they set before themselves. For example:

> 'But don't worry yourself by thinking out an ideal of what you ought to be or feel, and then get unhappy because you cannot realize it in fact! Start from what you are, and accept what God gives you; and do not imagine some futile perfection, which is not what God puts in your reach.
>
> 'As to thinking you are "unfit for a close union with God," of course you are; and that is why it is worthy of God to give such a union to those who are unworthy. But do not suppose that you know what this union "feels like" or what it implies! God gives it in His own way, not in our way.'

Again:

> 'Do not exhaust yourself by making *efforts*. You seem still to think that you can make yourself good! You can't. But God can, and will; though slowly, perhaps. We can prevent His action—we can get in His way. But we can hardly help Him at all. . . . Try to be simply at His disposition ready to be recollected or distracted as He wills; to feel good or to feel wicked (which is nearer to humility), to be wretched or consoled.'

And again (these quotations are typical—there are scores as good, or better):

> 'We must not think that distractions, dryness, desolation, is merely a state of trial which we pass through on our way to perfection—Perfection in this world is not a calm union with God, unless God so wishes. . . .
>
> 'Progress will mean becoming more and more indifferent to what state we are in. We ought to care less and less about our own souls, except about that higher part in which we ought to live united to God. We must not worry about perfection even; simply be what God enables us to be at this moment.
>
> 'When we realize that God is not only in every external event, but in every internal event—I mean in every involuntary feeling we have—we realize that, at every moment of our life, we are *in touch with God*, and His hand is on us. . . .
>
> '*Don't look into your soul*, but look at God. Don't ask yourself whether you are full of distractions or worldly thoughts, just say: "What a pity I am like that to-day." . . . Renew and intensify your acceptance of what has happened, and then *think of something else*. Look upon it as a temptation to think about your state. It is always mixed up with self-love. Laugh at yourself, and then think of God—or (out of prayer) of what you have to do.'

Like a good physician of the body, this excellent physician of the soul tried to enable his patients to dispense with him.

'As to "direction," I think most people at the present day want very little of it. The good director is like a nurse who teaches children how to walk alone.'

'I am not at all inclined to assume the rôle of a professional "director" to anyone. But I am quite willing to give occasional advice, for what it is worth; and I can answer letters. Giving people advice sometimes helps them to know their own mind.'

'Please understand,' he writes to the same correspondent, 'that I am writing as a friend, not as a "director." I do not pretend to special knowledge.'

The above meagre extracts can give the reader no adequate idea of what a treasury of spiritual wisdom, and common sense, these Letters are — so unpretentious, so completely devoid of rhetoric, shoddy pietism, and customary claptrap. Here we have the genuine article — religion pure and simple, unadulterated and undiluted. Moreover, the standpoint is rational throughout; and there is evidence of immense learning nowhere obtruded.

And how do the Jesuits react to this book — the Jesuits who approve of *Teresa Helena Higginson*?

Dom Chapman's *Spiritual Letters* were published in March, 1935. The June issue of *The Month*, the Jesuit organ, contained an eleven-page article entitled 'Abbot Chapman on Prayer,' by the Most Rev. the Archbishop of Hierapolis, Alban Goodier, S.J., attacking the book. Archbishop Goodier begins his article with characteristic Jesuit suavity:

'That most lovable, most scholarly, most downright and spontaneous of men, the late Abbot Chapman, has been presented to us by Dom Roger Hudleston as a spiritual guide, in a selection from his letters of spiritual direction.'

He then proceeds to create prejudice by stressing certain of Dom Chapman's idiosyncracies as mentioned by Dom Hudleston in his Preface. First, there was the Abbot's sense of humour, which 'flickered over and illuminated all he said and did, even when, as here, he was desperately in earnest.' Second, his tendency to exaggerate and overstate his points. Third, his habit of writing letters *currente calamo*, without weighing his words with sufficient nicety in the theological scales before committing them to paper. 'It must be confessed,' comments his Grace, 'that these are somewhat disconcerting warnings to one who takes up a book intended for spiritual guidance.'

In the course of his article the Archbishop shows himself an expert in the technique of reviewing a book by supplying pass-

ages apart from their context—a recognized device for those wishing *poignarder un auteur.*[2] There is no need to bore my readers by giving detailed extracts, since this has been done by Dom Chapman's editor, Dom Hudleston, in the *Downside Review* for July.[3]

The charge against Dom Chapman, as developed by this Jesuit *malleus haereticorum*, is twofold. It is said (1) that these letters contain close parallels, both in meaning and phraseology, to the condemned theses of Molinos,[4] and (2) that the ordinary reader will not seldom gain a wrong impression from the Abbot's words, and so either be scandalized or led astray.[5] With regard to (1), the Archbishop is careful not to accuse his victim directly of unorthodoxy. That would not be in the Jesuit mode, and would involve his Grace in having to make good his case before a judicial tribunal; all that is needed is to lay your hand on your heart and declare you are not *saying* what you are only *hinting*. Observe the skill of the following passage:

> 'Once more we would make it clear that in drawing these parallels we would not for a moment insinuate that the Abbot is unorthodox.

[2] This method was skilfully adopted by J. H. Newman in his 'Elucidation of Dr. Hampden's Theological Statements,' wherein extracts from the offending Bampton Lectures were printed stripped of their context, and as a consequence created the anticipated ecclesiastical storm.

[3] This article of Dom Hudleston's has since been re-published in pamphlet form by Messrs. Sheed and Ward at 10*d*.

[4] The case of Molinos sheds a clear light upon Jesuit strategy. Molinos published his *Spiritual Guide* in 1675. It was an enormous success, and its author was high in the favour of the reigning pontiff, Innocent XI. The Jesuits noted its success with alarm which gradually turned to fury as they watched convent after convent quitting Jesuit direction to pass under Molinist influence. People were casting aside their rosaries, and eyes were not raised at the Elevation of the Host because the worshippers were immersed in contemplation. An attack was opened in 1681, but Molinos was exculpated by the Holy Office. The Jesuit campaign which followed was a masterpiece of strategy, and the story of it can be read in Vol. iv of Lea's *History of the Inquisition*. As a result of this campaign the Pope was won over, and Molinos was arrested in 1685 and sentenced to imprisonment for life, and was probably murdered in prison. Readers of *John Inglesant* (a volume now no longer read by Anglican clergy) will be familiar with the story.

[5] 'Take heed that ye offend not one of these little ones' is a text which has well served the purpose of ecclesiastical *fascismo*. Why should the average lay person be regarded as a sort of half-wit, without sense to distinguish genuine spiritual food from *ersatz* products? No one, as Høffding has said, wants to rob the poor man of his ewe lamb; but when he insists upon parading it along the main street and demanding that the traffic should be held up on its account, one has to lodge a protest.

A careful student may see at once that there is a distinction between the passages quoted from his letters and the theses of Molinos; if not in the actual words, at least in the spirit that underlies them. But not every reader of the book will have the requisite training in the language of the mystics to make the distinction; and therein lies the danger.'

Would the innocent reader of this passage suspect that the Archbishop has only established his parallels by a judicious omission of important passages?[6]

The Archbishop then proceeds to misrepresent the tenour of a number of passages:

'The ordinary man of prayer will be apt to learn from the Abbot that the longer time he spends in prayer the better he will pray; that he must not try to pray otherwise than as it suits him; that if he feels any drawing to religious life or the priesthood he must resist until he is forced; that moral theology is not much use after all; that there is little to be gained by preparing meditation; that the *Paternoster* becomes unintelligible to one absorbed in prayer; that one may safely go to sleep during prayer if one feels so disposed; that to think during prayer is sheer distraction, interfering with our love of God.'

This ingenious passage is a tissue of misrepresentations, exposed by Dom Hudleston. Take his Grace's statement that Dom Chapman's teaching can lead one to think 'that one may safely go to sleep during prayer if one feels so disposed.' Even at the risk of wearying my readers, it seems worth while to examine this single example of the Jesuit's technique of misrepresentation (the others are similar). Dom Chapman had written as follows to a nun who sought his advice about falling asleep during prayer:

'I have come to the conclusion that one can remain united to God even when one goes to sleep in time of prayer. Don't laugh!

'I say this, because I think I told you that, when one feels one is going to sleep, it is good to try and *think* some good thoughts, or even reason out something, in order to keep awake. If I said so, I was wrong. I see that it simply stops prayer dead; so that thinking is more disastrous than sleep! I mean, quite seriously, that it is best to remain united to God's will (making any acts to fill up the time, that come of themselves, or none at all if none come), and not to mind if one's internal attitude is very much that of *trying* to go to sleep. But of course one can do one's best to keep off actual sleep by fidgeting, or changing one's position, and so forth.'

Now the Archbishop, though he expressly says 'The passage may be quoted in full,' omits the closing sentence wherein the Abbot definitely gives directions for avoiding sleep! And, as

[6] For evidence of this see Dom Hudleston's pamphlet.

Dom Hudleston points out:

> 'What the Abbot meant by "not minding if one's internal attitude is very much that of *trying* to go to sleep," would be well known to the Nun in question, since he constantly used the illustration set out in so many words in the very next letter to the same Nun (p. 122), *viz:* "The simplest way of making an act of attention to God, is by an act of inattention to everything else. It is rather like the act of trying to go to sleep."'

The remark that 'Moral theology seldom answers any difficult questions' would be specially distasteful to our Jesuit critic, who on the strength of it describes the Abbot as holding 'that moral theology is not much use after all.' But the context (unquoted) of the passage shows that the words objected to are not a general statement at all. They follow the sentence: 'Theories are never quite adequate to life' (p. 105), which (to quote Dom Hudleston) 'is certainly true when, as here, it is a question of giving a *definite answer to a definite question.*'

In the October issue of *The Month* the Archbishop returns to the attack in 'An Open Letter' to Dom Hudleston.[7] This second article of the Archbishop waxes somewhat acrimonious in tone, and is a typically Jesuit performance. For example, on the Molinos issue:

> 'You set the Abbot,' his Grace writes, addressing Dom Hudleston, 'as a humble disciple at the feet of St. John of the Cross and St. Francis de Sales; and you conclude with the shocked exclamation, twice marked: "And yet *The Month* seeks to identify his views with those of Molinos!!"
>
> 'Dear Father, *The Month* article sought to do nothing of the kind; on the contrary, it saw parallels in language which even you acknowledge, and it actually asked someone to show that they did *not* mean the same thing. . . .'[8]

The organ of the English and Irish Roman Catholic intelli-

[7] Meanwhile in August, a second edition of the *Letters* had appeared, with a new Preface by the editor, meeting the Archbishop's criticism in *The Month*.

[8] The last sentence is in its way a gem of Jesuit subtlety. As a matter of fact to seek for similarities of language, nay, clear parallels, between orthodox saints and condemned heretics is by no means difficult. Take the following from Molinos:

> 'To thank God in words and speech is not the part of internal souls which should remain in silence, setting no obstacle to what God is working in them.'

And then set alongside it a famous passage from St. Augustine's *Confessions: Et ipsa sibi anima sileat et transeat se non se cogitando* (*Conf.* ix, 10). 'And the soul herself were silent to herself, and by not thinking of self were to rise above self.'

gentsia is *The Dublin Review*. This outstanding quarterly entered the lists in its issue for January, 1936, with an eight-page review of Abbot Chapman's *Letters* by Abbot Vonier of Buckfast. It is an able and triumphant vindication of the late Abbot's orthodoxy, and may be said to have closed the controversy. Abbot Vonier writes:

> 'No one can take up the book without being carried away by the vividness of thought and sentiment revealed by these personal documents. . . . The impression is that a more complete self-portraiture could not have been given to the world than these letters from the pen of the distinguished scholar who now lies buried under the shadow of the Abbey Church of Downside. Truly the letters are Abbot Chapman all over; an intensely eager nature, an extremely independent mind, a heart as simple as that of a child, an indefatigable learner in the school of God and one that is happy to confess that he is learning daily and that he abandons willingly opinions to which at one time he had clung tenaciously. Moreover, with all that *badinage* which was one of the Abbot's charms in life, he was profoundly orthodox, nay, even gravely so.'

So much by way of introduction, sweeping away at one stroke all the reluctant, disingenuous, insincere laudations inserted by the Jesuit Archbishop into his attacks. Then Abbot Vonier passes on to examine the theological portions of Abbot Chapman's book, which contains a long letter to a Jesuit that is for practical purposes a theological treatise, and a most fascinating one at that. Chapman when at Christ Church, Oxford, had taken a First in Greats and was at home with ideas; but he was neither sceptic nor sophist. He had convictions, and had worked out, following the great Catholic doctors, a scheme of existence and a philosophy of life which stood four-square:

> 'Beyond all doubt the Abbot had a keen sense of orthodoxy and his long letter to a young Jesuit is a revelation of his own mental processes: "I always *try* to be *orthodox*, first of all. For Truth is above Charity, and above everything paramount"' (p. 212).

Again:

> 'No one, I am sure, could read the letters which Dom Hudleston has published without admiring the brilliant Catholicism of a mind that by trend and education was so likely to be side-tracked.'

And again:

> 'The reality of the spiritual life in the total absence of the experimental element has made Abbot Chapman an enthusiastic disciple of St. John of the Cross.'[9]

[9] The Spanish Saint is a Doctor of the Church, and his teaching, therefore, a standard of orthodoxy (though suspect in his lifetime and imprisoned).

Archbishop Goodier's strictures on Dom Chapman's readiness to dispense with 'thinking' in prayer are thus disposed of by Abbot Vonier:

> 'It would seem as if Abbot Chapman had created the impression of despising the cognitive element in prayer. I do not think the accusation is justified; he certainly taught the superiority and the relative independence of the act of love from the act of intellection; but in this he is quite orthodox.'

But what lies at the bottom of this attack on the *Letters*? It would seem to be prompted by Jesuit jealousy of the rising influence of the Benedictines in England! How otherwise is one to account for the Jesuit readiness to strain out Abbot Chapman's supposed 'Molinism' and swallow the camel of Teresa Higginson's gross and degrading superstition? The Jesuits are intelligent men and know what they are doing; they know that the nonsense about Teresa will only be read by proletarian rabble—the ignorant Irish of Manchester slums—whereas Abbot Chapman will be read by every intelligent and educated Roman Catholic in England, not to speak of a large number of English Church people.

It is not Abbot Chapman *the individual* whom the Jesuits are attacking and seeking to discredit, but the English Benedictines, and especially the Benedictine Abbey of Downside and its growing influence in the influential circles which the Jesuits wish to keep as their own special preserve. The Jesuits, though they know how to feed the masses with nonsense calculated to keep them doped and servile, have always sought to be the teachers of the socially and intellectually influential. They are now in danger of being pushed out of this enviable position by the Benedictines. Is it not obvious that no mind that fell under the influence of Abbot Chapman would ever submit to Jesuit direction again?

Father Rickaby, S.J., in commenting on Loyola's *Annotations*, writes as follows:

> 'A great art in giving the *Exercises* is to know what to withhold, from whom, and for how long. People will rush into Mysticism, if you let them, *before they have learnt the first lessons of faith and obedience*' (italics mine).

In other words, if you let them walk on their own feet they will be lost to Jesuit control!

The Roman Catholic public in England is being emancipated by spiritual liberators like Abbot Chapman. He helps them to walk without crutches. What can a Jesuit do? He can attempt to discredit the Abbot by stating that his writings (though not, of course, at this stage, heretical) are dangerously misleading. Those who are not equipped with sufficient knowledge may be led astray. And who are those with insufficient knowledge? Surely those who are not under Jesuit direction!

THE ATHENIAN CHRIST

By Kenneth T. Henderson, M.A., B.Litt.

'There have been many Christs in the world, even all who like Him loved righteousness and hated iniquity.'—Origen *Contra Celsum* vi, 70.

'A LITTLE man who always went about without sandals,' a short squat figure 'thighs and shoulders of the same width,' with a broad, ugly, rugged face, a face which was an affectionate family joke among his circle—such was Socrates, the Athenian philosopher, who drank the hemlock in 399 B.C. He wrote nothing, he founded no school. These were the works of his greatest disciple Plato. But Socrates himself spent his time walking about Athens, frequenting places where the most people gathered, and talking incessantly to all kinds of people. 'He is always,' says Alcibiades, 'talking about great market-asses, and brass-founders, and leather-cutters, and skin-dressers; and this is his perpetual custom, so that any dull or unobservant person might easily laugh at his discourse.' Another companion, Callicles, irritably exclaims, 'How you go on, always talking in the same way, Socrates.' 'Yes, Callicles,' replied Socrates, 'and also about the same things.' Callicles answers angrily, 'Yes, by the gods, you are literally always talking of cobblers and pedlars and cooks and doctors, as if this had to do with our argument.' Another friend says, 'You really must shut up about these shoemakers and smiths; I think they must be worn out from being so often in your mouth.' But Xenophon also tells us that whenever he talked with these craftsmen they got some benefit from him.

Only in this talk of the streets could Socrates do what he so loved doing. He was accustomed to say — and it is the constant refrain in his discourse — that men would take endless trouble to make themselves skilled and competent in their trades, but they would make no serious effort at all to discover for themselves the one thing needful, to think out the nature of the good life and what it is that makes life worth living at all. 'See here my friend,' he says in his *Apology*, his great speech before his accusers, 'you are an Athenian, a citizen of the greatest city in the world, the most famous for wisdom and power; and are you not ashamed to care for money and money-making and fame and reputation, and not care at all, not make an effort, for truth and understanding and the welfare of your soul?'

When Socrates took any time off from the task to which he so cheerfully and light-heartedly and devoutly dedicated himself, he was a monumental mason, his father's trade, but if his exasperated wife Xanthippe is to be believed, he did little work at it. This good woman once threw a bucket of water over him in a vain effort to stop him talking. He had another irritating habit of bringing people home to dinner without letting her know. 'If they are reasonable people,' he used to say, 'they will not mind taking pot-luck, but if they are not they are not worth troubling about at all.' He laughed at her good-naturedly as a necessary trial, but she took his part vehemently in the last tragedy and was with him near the end.

He was a comic figure, and many laughed at him, but men of the highest eminence like Xenophon revered him. They were soldiers and Socrates had been a soldier too — distinguished especially by imperturbable steadiness in the nerve-shaking experience of retreat. In battle Alcibiades had owed his life to him. Socrates could drink a whole company under the table and maintain his calm flow of lucid discourse until the sun rose, when, without sleep, he prepared for the coming day by taking a bath.

Great talkers live in history because they found great listeners. An amazing circle gathered round this homely, shabby figure. There was the aristocratic, brilliant, dissolute, beautiful, unstable Alcibiades, whom Socrates loved and managed to reform for a time. There was Xenophon, the hero of the Retreat

of the Ten Thousand. But perhaps the most beloved friend of Socrates was Crito, the substantial business man, entirely without the Socratic subtlety, but a plain honest soul who had caught a glimpse of his friend's meaning and reverenced it. There are few more moving things in literature than the dialogue between Crito and Socrates under sentence of death. Crito visits Socrates in prison and offers to risk his life and all his possessions by bribing the jailor to allow Socrates to escape. Other business men would help. 'Anyway, Socrates,' he says, 'it wouldn't cost much.' But the master, with his familiar sharp logic, half-playful and wholly serious, proves that 'there must be no yielding, no running away, no deserting of one's post.' The laws of Athens must be obeyed, or they must be changed by persuasion.

The dialogue ends: 'Crito, my dear friend Crito, that, believe me, is what I seem to hear, as the Corybants hear flutes in the air; and the sound of those words rings and echoes in my ears and I can listen to nothing else. Believe me, as far as I see at present, if you speak against them you will speak in vain. Still, if you think you can do any good say on.'

Crito: 'No, Socrates, I have nothing I can say.'

Socrates: 'Then let us leave it so, Crito; and let things go as I have said, for this is the way God has pointed out.'

It is the fate of a great man to have great enemies, and the arch-enemy in this case was Aristophanes, the writer of brilliant comedies. He was convinced that men like Socrates and Euripides with their habit of persistently 'de-bunking' conventional ready-made ideas and prejudices, were a deadly danger to the structure of society and the great traditions of Athens. The conflict between Socrates and his enemies was as irreconcilable as that between Christ and His enemies. Morality to Aristophanes and his friends was mass obedience to hallowed customs and patriotic traditions. Socrates goaded men to question and criticize custom, and he taught that morality was a matter of personal insight and decision. At moments he rose higher, and in the dialogue called the *Banquet* (*Symposium*) he declares that love is a spirit which spans the gulf between earth and heaven — not the mere desire for beauty but an instinct of immortality. The scepticism, freedom and originality in his teach-

ing were regarded as dangerous. People like Aristophanes saw that few people could re-build their beliefs without the help of authority, and they thought that the traditional religion and customs of Athens were needed to hold society together. Therefore the comic playwright mercilessly caricatured Socrates. But the one great man took fairly the measure of the other. The comedian complains that the philosopher is impregnable because he wanted nothing for himself, and the imperturbable Socrates said that ridicule was useful so far as it helped to reveal one's faults, and otherwise it did not matter. Aristophanes had too much sense of humour to be one of the accusers who brought Socrates to trial.

In the dialogues with Socrates which Plato records the minor characters are full of life. There is the vain actor Ion, who claims to be the greatest living exponent of Homer. There is the boy Lysis, a delightfully natural youngster, keen-witted, well-bred, good-mannered, who leaves his game of knuckle-bones to listen, and is thrilled to find himself drawn into discussion with Socrates, who teases him into contradicting himself on the nature of friendship.

In the background is the greatest of them all, the young Plato. With a rapture of memory firing his own artistic genius, Plato preserves for later ages that circle of Socrates and his friends. Plato, in the range of his genius, was a greater man than his beloved master. In the dialogues it is impossible to tell where his own thoughts begin and those of Socrates end.

Through all the banter and sparkle of wit, the teasing and love of dispute, the often dry logic-chopping and wearisome play on words, the great beauty, there shines forth the one great aim and conviction of Socrates : that it was the chief business of man to discover by thinking the true end of life. To do this man should examine his ordinary motives and desires and opinions to test their quality and their power to satisfy his whole nature, including his highest faculties. Socrates despised what the French call '*l'homme moyen sensuel*,' the 'average sensual man,' and set himself to destroy that man's complacence, and to convince him that he was below the human level. The earnest attempt to appreciate life would, so Socrates believed, lead to the discovery that Virtue was the supreme aim and enjoyment

of man, and that the tremendous breadth of meaning in this wide word Virtue must be revealed in its nature by being wrought into the common activities of life — the work of the shoemakers, and stone masons, and corselet manufacturers of whom he was always talking. One must love life — in its homely details first, then in its great issues and principles, and thus ascend to the vision of eternal beauty. Virtue, so revealed in the glory of its many forms and colours, would become beauty and irresistibly attract to itself the whole nature of him who had come to see the eternal values as they really are. 'Virtue,' said Socrates, 'is knowledge,' or, as we should say, 'insight.' So acting, the soul of man as he went about his ordinary occupations would live in the eternal world, and when released by death from the troublesome drag of the body it would live more fully and completely in that eternal world, and enter into the fellowship of just men made perfect. The ideal of Socrates is thus far on the way to that enshrined in the words, 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.' The soul, he held, was eternal and immortal because it was made to share in and to enjoy that which is eternal. Little wonder that the Greek Fathers of the Christian Church claimed Plato as a great Christian teacher and affirmed that he was inspired by the Holy Spirit.

Socrates himself rises to his full stature in his defence before the citizens of Athens—the judicial court was drawn by lot from the whole civic body—and in his talks with his friends before he drinks the hemlock. He is charged with corrupting youth, and irritates his judges by playing with his accusers. His defence consists of the explanation of his life's aim. Although he has three young sons, he will not bring them into court or make any other appeal to mercy. 'And why is it,' he says, 'that I will not do anything of the kind? Not from pride, men of Athens, nor is it because I am indifferent to death; it is for the sake of my honour and yours and the honour of the city.' After the verdict of guilty he asserts his serene conviction that he has done the State great service. He has held aloof from money-making and public life. 'I held aloof from it all. I should have been of no use there to you or myself, but I set about going in private to each individual man and doing him the greatest of all services, as I assert — trying to persuade every one of you not to think of what he

had but of what he was, and how he might grow wise and good.' The procedure after the conviction was that the accusers fixed a penalty — in this case, death — and the accused fixed a penalty, and the jurors voted which of the two should be inflicted. Socrates maintained that he deserved a public pension, but that he could raise a five shilling fine, and his friends would probably raise it to five pounds. This contempt of court brought on him the fatal sentence. He had been in effect offered his freedom if he would stop talking. 'Perhaps someone will say, "But Socrates, cannot you let us alone and live in peace and quietness?" Now this is just what it is hardest to make you, some of you, believe. If I were to say that this would be to disobey God, and therefore I cannot hold my peace, you would not believe me; you would say I was using my irony. And if I say again that it is in fact the greatest good of man to talk about virtue every day . . . if I say that a life without self-examination is not worth living — you would believe that even less. Yet it is so even as I tell you — only it is not easy to get it believed.'

After the death penalty he adds, 'It may be that the difficulty is not to escape death but guilt. Guilt is swifter than death.' The divine voice has been his constant guide. It has often stopped him in mid speech. 'Yet when I left home this morning the signal from God was not against me, nor when I came up here into court, nor in my speech whatever I was about to say . . . And you too my judges must think of death with hope, and remember that this at least is true: that no evil can come to a good man in life or death, and that he is not forgotten of God.'

The same noble dignity, as the *Phaedo* records, marked his last discourse with his disciples, while in prison he awaited the preparation of the hemlock draught by his jailor. Discoursing on the immortality of the soul, he asserts that a man who has lived rightly ought to be confident about the future of his soul and to face the hazard of death bravely. 'You then,' he continued, 'Simmias and Cebes and the rest, will each of you depart at some future time, but now destiny summons me, as a tragic writer would say, and it is nearly time for me to betake myself to the bath; for it appears to me better to drink the poison after I have had a bath, and not to trouble the women with washing my body after I am dead.'

MODERN POETRY

By J. P. Bulkeley, M.A., C.I.E.

NEVER were modern poets so disastrously obsessed by the pursuit of modernity. Ours are so afraid of saying anything which has been said before that they are forced to write about one another, or things even less important, and they are so preoccupied with experiments in form and diction that they cannot write spontaneously. So we listen in vain for the two first essentials of great poetry, the lyric note, and thought which serves to interpret and fortify the spirit of men.

'Poetry seems of late,' remarked Dr. Alington, 'to have failed in its task of giving that testimony to the inherent greatness of man and to his infinite possibiltiies, which is the greatest contribution which it can make to the world.'[1] That was the theme of Sophocles' noblest chorus; in search of it we return to Virgil in middle life and old age and are not disappointed. The great poets of all ages have borne the same witness. It is the special glory of English poetry, the main theme of Spenser and Shakespeare, true children of the Renaissance, of Shelley, Wordsworth and the early nineteenth century romantics, and pre-eminently of Tennyson and Browning. Davidson, Francis Thompson, Noyes, Flecker, Rupert Brook, W. W. Gibson, and other Edwardian and Georgian poets did not neglect it. But we turn in vain to most of the verse published in the last fifteen years for any reassurance as to our essential nobility. We find in fact little reassurance on anything of importance, for modern verse is rarely significant and often unintelligible.

It is the same even in anthologies. Mr. Robert Bridges, who was himself so preoccupied with metrical experiments that he rarely wrote great poetry, sought to make amends by compiling an anthology on the Spirit of Man from which he entirely excluded Browning, perhaps its greatest interpreter. It is because Browning thought too nobly of man that he is ignored to-day.

Two living poets, Mr. A. E. Housman and Mr. T. S. Eliot,

[1] *Elementary Christianity* (Longman, 1927), p. 34.

have recently published useful books[2] on the nature of poetry. Mr. Housman defends meaningless poetry (though he never wrote any) on the ground that 'meaning is of the intellect, poetry is not'; he observes with justice that there has been lately 'some repressing, some silencing' of poetry . . . 'some touch of frost to the imaginative life of the soul. Mr. Eliot (who often wrote meaningless poetry, and whose prose was, until he took to Drama, better worth reading than his verse) remarks on the aimlessness of modern poets, 'Modern poets take themselves very seriously and write a great deal about one another and their art,' but 'beyond belief that poetry has something of importance to do, there does not seem to be much agreement.'[3]

Such theories as they have about Poetics seem to the present writer to be mostly negative — we must avoid poetical language, we must avoid the fantastic,[4] we must not tickle the ear by richness of rhyme or regularity of metre. We may please the initiated by severity of form, but we must not seek to give any other aesthetic pleasure, we must eschew the emotional, and avoid above all saying anything which has been said before. There is a deliberate cult of what has been called 'the hard, matter of fact skeleton of poetic logic.'

Perhaps Mr. J. B. Priestley[5] hit the nail on the head: 'Day Lewis, Auden, Spender and the rest are clever, but their boiling point is too high. Poets should be able to boil quickly. The trouble is that these people have been influenced by T. S. Eliot, and Eliot is definitely a bad influence. He is donnish, pedantic, and cold.' They have also been influenced by the later manner of a better poet, Mr. W. B. Yeats, who has, alas, disciplined himself to write without adornment and with ruthless self-repression and bleakness.

The modern school have selected only two of the Victorians and Edwardians for admiration, Gerald Manley Hopkins, and

[2] *The Name and Nature of Poetry,* Housman (Cambridge University Press).

[3] *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism,* Eliot (Faber).

[4] A touch of the fantastic often makes the difference between poetry and mere verse. It enhanced the charm of many poems in the earlier anthologies of *Georgian Poetry,* published by the Poetry Bookshop between 1911 and 1920. Mr. Walter de la Mare seems now its only exponent.

[5] In *New Verse,* June, 1935.

(to a lesser extent) Canon R. W. Dixon. Why they have selected Dixon, the most precious and elaborately mannered of the pre-Raphaelites, heaven knows! Perhaps just because he is difficult and obscure, and was a friend and correspondent of Hopkins. The recent apotheosis of Hopkins is less surprising, for in many ways he suits the modern mind. He anticipated T. E. Lawrence by unnecessarily withdrawing from the world when, to the disappointment of his friends, he buried his great learning and poetical genius in the Society of Jesus. He was then transferred from one unimportant post to another, always unappreciated, always a square peg in a round hole, always unhappy and a problem to his superiors. His theological and religious ideas were congenial to the modern mood, for in his soul there was always 'an acute sense of sin,' of 'alienation from a majestic and transcendent God,' 'a conflict between love and fear,' 'a sense of failure to interpret the will of God in practical life.'[6] Moreover, he wrote very difficult and sometimes unintelligible verse, and avoided poetical diction; his metre and form were experimental and often deliberately based on Welsh classical poetry.[7] He states in one of his letters that he was 'fascinated with cynghanedd or consonant chime,' and he used it in such phrases as 'warm-laid grave of womb-life grey.'

The following extract from a poem in *New Verse*, February, 1935, will show with what results cynghanedd is imitated by a modern poet:

> 'More frozen fearfulness, icicle-hung hysteria, hold
> World's wit than, one believes, by ill-will will be bones bare.
> Yet, too, there are, cursed, who say to the frost, Freeze on,
> What's wit, what's the world? We through the cold
> Have our vision, our own. And they, cursed, do not care
> If no sun-season return, releasing fair reason.'

The above passage was selected almost at random, but seems to the writer a fair example of imitative cynghanedd in English. If it be so it is clear that poets and their readers will need respectively a great deal more practise and familiarity with the new technique before it will serve as an effective medium for saying anything that matters. The writer is not running riot in

[6] Quotations from a note on Hopkins' Religious Life by Mr. Humphry House, *New Verse*, April, 1935, a number devoted to the study of Hopkins.

[7] In the same number of *New Verse* there is an interesting note by Mr. L. L. Wyn Griffith on 'The Welsh Influence in Hopkins' Poetry.'

vers libres, but struggling to express himself through a very difficult medium.[8]

Mr. Alfred Noyes and Mr. T. S. Eliot began life as agnostics, Mr. J. C. Hardwick in an article on 'The Intellectuals in Retreat'[9] commented on the fact that Mr. Noyes has become a Roman Catholic, Mr. Eliot an Anglo-Catholic. There is nothing surprising, or relevant to this paper, in the fact that both came to desire reconciliation with God; but it is significant that both poets joined religious communities which attach comparatively little importance to the part played by human intelligence in attaining such reconciliation. Mr. Eliot (who states the truism that 'a man's theory of the place of poetry is not independent of his view of life in general') expresses regret that 'Shelley did not put his poetic gifts, which were certainly of the first order, to the service of more tenable beliefs,' and he eulogizes Dryden very warmly, partly, it would seem, because he turned his poetic gifts to Christian apologetics. 'I was intoxicated,' says Mr. Eliot, 'by Shelley's poetry at the age of fifteen, and now find it almost unreadable.'

One can understand, but cannot but deplore, the change in Mr. Eliot. So long as modern poets are influenced by him, they are not likely to think or write nobly of man. Take his volume, 'Poems 1905-25.' Many are obscure in meaning, but one *leit motif* clearly runs through them, the eternal contrast between man's spiritual pretensions and his physical limitations and lusts. Mr. Eliot, in this volume at any rate, consistently stresses the latter at the expense of the former.

When other modern poets have anything intelligible to say it is mostly on the same theme. They are true only to the ignoble side of life. Here is a poem by Mr. Bernard Spencer which appeared in *New Verse*, February, 1935:

> The old man bearded with illness weakens upstairs;
> My sister, who is great with child, speaks of our early long days
> In the house with the fig-tree in the garden;
> We speak of what the nurses taught,
> And the schools which teach our class,
> Of what friends we had,

[8] The rules of cynghanedd are so complicated that Welsh classical poetry has never had a wide appeal, even in Wales. English imitators do not follow the rules strictly, but even so they are attempting a very difficult exercise in prosody.

[9] *Modern Churchman*, Jan.-Feb., 1935.

Of theatres, difference that money made,
My sister great with child, and the old man dying upstairs.

Across our stroke-by-stroke built up picture
And, since, our eating with new friends
And turning upon new living ways
As if exploring a turning stream,
Our laughing, travelling at different times;
Memory of gross South and North,
Making big slash and score
With asleep, hurting, and death and birth
Scrawls in comment which way the master winds wear.

Many writers have protested recently in the *Modern Churchman* against a theology which ascribes our natural faculties to the devil and repudiates reason as an aid to reconciliation with God. Our poets, too, are unduly influenced by our present defeatism. That is a pity, for poets might do much more than theologians to bring us to a nobler mood.

Even the modern poet does not always let us down. I will conclude by quoting, with grateful acknowledgment to *Harper's Magazine*, November, 1935, some fragments of a poem by Edna St. V. Millay, called 'Conversation at Midnight.' She has something to say very relevant to the theme of this paper, and she says it very effectively:

'In the Rotary club and in the Communistic state there is no mourning
When Dr. Cog dies.
The place of Dr. Cog is immediately and automatically filled by Dr. Cog;
And Dr. Cog and Dr. Cog
Are all alike as two cogs.'

John said: 'A man is tired of being a town all by himself;
He wants to be a grain of sand in a shovel-full of sand, in cement-mixer
That is mixing cement to cement together the bricks in one of the walls
Of one of the buildings connected with one of the cement-works
On the outskirts of a town.'

Richardo said: 'Man has never been the same since God died.
He has taken it very hard. Why, you'd think it was only yesterday
The way he takes it;
Not that he says much, but he laughs much louder than he used to,
And he can't bear to be left alone for a minute, and he can't
Sit still. . . . .

He gets along pretty well as long as it's daylight; he works very hard,
And he amuses himself very hard with many cunning amusements
This clever age affords.
But it's all no good; the moment it begins to get dark, as soon as it's night,
He goes out and howls over the grave of God.

It comes down to this: he wants to die too, he wants to be nothing,
And the next best thing to being nothing
Is being nobody.'

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF HISTORY FOR THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION

By the Editor.

'WHAT has Christianity to do with history'? asked a science graduate in impassioned tones at a Modern Churchmen's Conference. Whether he meant by history the events of the past, or the account given of those events, whether from the descriptive or didactic or generic points of view, it is impossible to say, for he vouchsafed no explanations. In a discussion of the significance of history for the Christian religion, one is plunged into ambiguity. There are so many views of what is the Christian religion and also so many views of what is history.

Many years ago I was cycling on the Yorkshire moors with a Professor in a Colonial University who had taken his First in Greats at Balliol. We talked of religion. He said: 'I should still be a Christian even if it were proved that Jesus Christ had never lived. I believe in His teaching about God and man. I believe in His ideals and principles. I try to live in the light of them. That, I take it, is being a Christian.'

I was once playing golf with an Anglo-Catholic clergyman in Lent. One of the ways in which he kept Lent was by restricting himself to the use of a single iron club during the penitential season. He told me that a friend of his had become a Benedictine. Then I said: 'He has, I suppose, become a Roman Catholic, because you cannot become a member of the Benedictine Order without being a Roman Catholic.' He replied: 'He has not become a Roman Catholic, yet he is a Benedictine; he has taken the Benedictine vows and is living by the Rule of St. Benedict. Surely that is to be a Benedictine.'

I have related these two stories in order to indicate that it is possible to make a religion one's own in the most practical way without becoming a member of the historic organization of that religion. In other words, that one can be a Christian without being a member of the Christian Church.

St. Augustine, and many of the Greek Fathers, held that there were Christians before Jesus Christ, but I hardly suppose that they would have claimed that there was a Christian Church before Christ. If it had not been for this Church I doubt if today we should know anything at all about Christ's example, spirit, ideals, principles, and therefore none of us would be Christians in the sense in which my Professorial friend declared himself to be a Christian. For notwithstanding the speculations of the Christ-myth school, it is generally admitted by serious students of Christian origins that Jesus Christ was a historic person and the source of the Christian Church and the New Testament.

This conclusion, however, does not overthrow my Professorial friend's conclusion that the essential truths in the Christian religion are not historical — they are moral and spiritual. The Christian religion is not essentially dependent upon the place and time and other circumstances amid which it originated. The religion itself enshrines eternal and universal truth able to be experienced here and now. Its time and place and manner of origin are all secondary and comparatively unimportant. Now that is the real *crux* in the discussion of the significance of history for the Christian religion.

Christianity, it is contended, is a historical religion. It is this which differentiates it from many other religions. This contention is true. There is no historical element in the primitive religions. There is none in Naturism, in Animism, in Totemism, in Fetishism, in Polydaemonism. When, however, we get to the State religions, especially in the form of Polytheism with a pantheon, then the historical element seems to come into religion. It comes in, not as strict history, but as myth — stories of the gods, their genealogies, relationships, adventures, activities, This brings the gods into relationship with localities and men and historical events, and so religion and history become interwoven in the cultus of polytheistic State religions.

Again in the case of the 'Founded Religions,' that is to say, that latest type of religion which owes its origin to a personal founder, like Zoroastrianism, Judaism, Buddhism, Islam, and Christianity, history comes into relation with a religion of this kind in the form of the life and mission of its founder. All the

'Founded Religions' are historical in this sense that in their origin they are due to a historic founder, and owe, all that is most characteristic in them, to him.

But yet this does not exhaust the ways in which a religion may be related to history. Dean Inge has said that for the Jew his nation's history is his religion. And Thomas Carlyle said that the history of every nation is its Bible — an idea which he had undoubtedly derived from his study of the Old Testament. The Jew, then, and he has been followed by the Christian, views his religion as historical in a much more profound sense than that his religion has had a historical founder. For the Jew, every incident, every crisis, every achievement in his national history, is the action of the God of his religion. Thus, for the Jew, the history of his religion is a divine drama by the study of which the divine Nature and the divine Will unveil themselves to men. The Jews' history is thus sacred history, and for the Christian this is true also, save that this divine drama, this sacred history, is not the history of one people but of all mankind. It is not the history of a national religion only, nor of a single religious society, but of the whole course of religious evolution on this planet. Thus for the Christian, religion and history are closely interwoven, for in history God unveils Himself to man, and man, if he possesses the eye of faith, learns to perceive in history the Nature and Will of God. In that case, it may be urged that the relation of religion to history does not differ from the relation of religion to nature. Nature can become for its religious student an unveiling of the Divine Being — His presence, attributes and purposes. The revelation of God in history is the natural sequence, for the religious evolutionist, of the revelation of God in nature. And in that case there is yet a third stage — the revelation of God in human personality and in individual experience.

The Christian religion is a universal religion — it excludes and can exclude nothing from its cognisance. Nature and history and human personality are all its concern. The object of its *cultus* is unveiled through them all but in different degrees — the human personality is the throne of Deity.

A modern philosopher asserts that wherever God is, He is not in history, and many a scientist, in his own sphere, is in

agreement with the astronomer Lalande who said, 'I have swept the heavens with my telescope and I have not found God,' and the author of *Le Mécanique céleste*, who when charged by Napoleon with making no reference to God in his treatise, replied, 'Sire, I had no need of that hypothesis.' It is the insecurity and conflicting character of the Divine revelation, whether in nature or in history, in comparison with the revelation of God in human personality, which vexes the souls of those who would discard the appeal to nature and history as sources of Divine revelation. To-day the sceptical attitude towards history, owing to the development of historical criticism, has greatly increased. When Lessing and his school maintained that the eternal truths of religion cannot be securely based upon the uncertain facts of history, men were much more convinced that they knew what history was and could rely upon it than is the case to-day. The Cambridge philosopher, James Ward, in his *Naturalism and Agnostcism*,[1] wrote, 'The historical is what we *understand* least and what concerns us most,' but the popular tendency since his day has been towards a growing contemptuousness both of the veracity of history and its significance.

A contemporary American writer, Professor Cole, exemplifies this tendency in his statement:

> 'The ordinary historical fact is, indeed, a subjective judgment on the part of the historian rather than an objective record of something which occurred in the past.'[2]

Aldous Huxley, in his notable Essay on Pascal, points out that

> 'Men long to know the meaning of events: . . . Christianity provides such an answer and satisfies these natural longings . . .
>
> 'Pascal tried to demonstrate the Historical Truth of the Christian revelation. But, alas! there is no such thing as Historical Truth — there are only more or less probable opinions about the past, opinions which change from generation to generation. History is a function, mathematically speaking, of the degree of ignorance and of the personal prejudices of historians.'

Although such views are very extreme, yet they exemplify what we are well aware of — the fluctuating character of humanity's estimates of its knowledge of the past and its variant interpretations of the historical data provided.

[1] Vol. II, p. 280.
[2] *The American Review*, p. 267.

Christianity is far from being exempt from these fluctuating estimates, and if the truth of the Christian religion is to be based on history alone it cannot be securely based for us, for we cannot feel secure of possessing historical certitude. Prof. A. E. Taylor, a convinced Christian, in his third Gifford Lecture, 'Religion and the Historical,' delivered in 1930, writes: 'It is not too much to say that there never has been, and never will be, a trustworthy *Life of Jesus Christ*.' The outcome of these considerations seems to force us to the conclusion that religion's only secure basis for the individual must be a verifiable personal experience such as 'I called upon the Lord and He heard me,' or 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.'

Now this verifiable personal experience needs for its right interpretation to be compared with, and even corrected by, and supplemented by, the experience of other Christians, studied singly and collectively. Hence, verifiable personal experience, as the supreme proof of the truth of the Christian religion, ought not to be regarded as something separate from historic Christianity, but conjoined to it. As Christians, we become members of a historic religious society—the Christian Church, going back to the Apostles and even to Jesus Christ Himself — and enshrining and propagating a particular kind of religious experience. This experience is, in one of its aspects, a historic experience. It is clear then that our personal Christian experience must be compared with, and corrected by, this historic Christian experience.

But those who claim that Christianity is a historic religion intend to go further than that: they mean to assert that the Creator performed certain actions within the sphere of human history which are not only indicative, and authoritatively indicative, of the true Nature of God, but also of His Creative Purpose and Will for man. These facts are pre-eminently found in the personality and mission of Jesus Christ. The acceptance of these Divine historic facts, together with their Christian interpretation, is for these Christians the acceptance of the Christian religion and the rejection of these so-called facts as facts of history, or the rejection of the Christian interpretation of them is regarded as equivalent to the rejection of the Christian faith, even though he who rejects them accepts the moral and spiritual

truths enshrined in the teaching of Jesus and seeks to live his life in obedience to them.

Here we are back again where we began. Perhaps the Christian Church of the future will recognize that both classes are Christian and that both have the right to live and work together within the fellowship of the Christian Church. The very fact of our Christian experience compels us to affirm that the Christian Church, the Christian Scriptures, the Christian Spirit, the Christian Way of Life, originated with Jesus Christ, and that if Jesus Christ had not been a historic fact, the world would possess none of these things to-day.

If the Christian religion were to renounce its entangling alliance with history, just as if it were to renounce its entangling alliance with nature, it would doubtless deliver itself from a great number of apologetic difficulties, but it would be like cutting off the head as a cure for toothache. Christianity would then be a mystical cultus combined with the practice of personal and social ethical ideals. But could it survive in that form? We doubt if it could, and at any rate until the Christian Church is absolutely compelled to make such an experiment, she would be well-advised not to do so. Maritain has asked: '*faut-il abolir l'histoire pour faire de la politique?*' and we may well ask: Is it necessary to abolish history in order to maintain the Christian religion? The Gnostics made the experiment in various forms and they lost, not only their religious relationship with nature and with history, but also with those moral and spiritual elements in the Christian religion which it is believed could be preserved if relations with nature and history were severed.

There is need here for some cautionary advice if the Christian religion is to retain its relationship to history, and that is, that the authorities of that religion should take every care that they are keeping that religion united to history, and not to myth. It is the latter which to religion has always seemed the more attractive partner. Dr. C. C. J. Webb in his recent book, *The Historical Element in Religion*, points out that the Christian religion has made this kind of alliance in its past, *e.g.* with the Virgin Birth, which comes in the sphere, not of history but of religious myth.

Cardinal Manning maintained that the appeal to history

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC

against the Church's traditional dogmas and ecclesiastical authority was really heresy. Yet with the advance in historical criticism we must not only be prepared for this appeal but must welcome it and, what is more, accept the verdicts of scientific history. To history thou hast appealed and unto history thou shalt go, but the verdicts which the Church will receive in that Appellate Court will not prove always to be of a congenial kind, because such verdicts will demand the re-formulation of theological dogmas.

To-day Christian teachers who know most about history seem to be reluctant to point their hearers, as did their predecessors, to the ways of God in history. Human history is too full of horror and injustice, too full of terrible mistakes and heart-breaking tragedies to make it, for many, a convincing and inspiring example of Divine action. Yet history, if it be what the Christian believes it to be, a working out of the Divine Will in the sphere of human affairs, ought to furnish visible examples of the Divine righteousness and the Divine wisdom. What the Christian student believes himself to see in history is the interaction of this Divine Will and a multitude of human wills, the possessors of which are in many cases the slaves, at least temporarily, of ignorance, lust, greed, cruelty and many other evil passions. It is only when this evil human element is separated from the drama of human history that it is possible to see a Divine purpose running through it and accomplishing the realization of Divine ideals. This working out of the Divine Will in history is a very slow process, and only very long and profound views enable the spectator of human history to perceive it. It is one of the functions of the Christian Scriptures to teach men to view human history in this way. The retort to the declaration: 'Wherever God is, He is not in history,' is, that God is in history working behind and through it but that this Divine action is only perceptible to the eye of Christian faith or at least to him who accepts the Christian hypothesis of creative purpose.

JESUS CHRIST AND THE PROBLEM OF SUFFERING

By the Rev. Samuel McComb, D.D.

AMONG the many problems that have challenged human reason since the dawn of self-reflection none has touched man more poignantly than the problem of pain. Why suffering should be the universal fate, why it should be so precarious in its incidence, falling here and not there, without any apparent ethical justification — these puzzles have perplexed the human mind from of old and still perplex it. Every philosophy and every theology worthy of the name have tried to grapple with them and have been worsted in the struggle. It is just because of this failure that so many to-day reject the claims of religion. Their feeling is represented by the famous picture which portrays the Almighty about to create the world when His arm is arrested by an angelic intelligence crying, 'If Thou art about to create such a world—stay Thine hand!'

The traditional view of suffering is that it comes from God, either to vindicate His law of righteousness, or to purify the soul from sin, conscious or unconscious, or to test man's spiritual fidelity. These ideas are reflected in our devotional formularies. For example, in the American Prayer-book a prayer for those in distress is introduced by the words, taken over from the Old Testament, 'Almighty God, who dost not willingly afflict the children of men,' and then the prayer goes on to lament the miseries which, however reluctantly, God deliberately wills. But such a notion makes it difficult to clear the Divine character of wanton cruelty. Better no God at all than such a God. In the reaction against this primitive theory, many deem all suffering to be an injustice rooted in the very nature of things. For these, God is either an Epicurean Deity far removed from the dust and struggle of human existence or He is a figment of the imagination. As a distinguished rationalist lecturer once said to me: 'I believe that there must be a Creator to account for the existence of the universe, but of His character I know nothing

and can know nothing.' Minds of a religious cast take refuge in the experience that suffering borne for love's sake ceases to be dry and barren pain and passes into exultant joy. In none of these views is it possible to find permanent satisfaction. Yet each has much to say for itself. Greek tragedy and Jewish prophecy proclaimed this truth on the ground that in a moral universe there must be an essential bond between wrong and its evil consequences. But to turn this principle into a law whose operation is universally recognizable, and to assert that the consequences of transgression do not often fall upon the innocent, is to fly in the face of history and experience.

Again, it is true that much suffering borne in patience and self-sacrificing devotion becomes a joyous service for the sake of others. But what about the suffering which apparently subserves no good purpose whatever, such suffering, for example, as the morbidities and confusions of neurasthenia or the agonies of cancer? To say that God inflicts these terrors on His children is to invite atheism.

It is at this point that the real problem emerges. Much suffering can be justified as discipline or warning, and so far it presents no enigma calling for solution. But there is a vast residuum of suffering for which these theories suggest an explanation no longer acceptable. The anguish of disease, the degradation and moral dangers of extreme poverty — these inflictions work evil and only evil. And it is significant that the two classes which lay nearest the heart of Christ were the sick and the poor. And herein lies a lesson for His Church.

We open the Gospel history to find out what light, if any, He throws upon our question. And what do we discover? To begin with, He offers no speculative solution of the difficulty. Why man is born to suffer, He knows not, nor does the question apparently trouble Him. He is the preacher of a practical religion. Suffering is here as a tragic experience, and He is concerned with its relation to God and to man. But though He does not solve the difficulty, He shows that men had wrongly apprehended it, and by their false theologizing have laid still heavier burdens on the soul.

It is a sign of His spiritual greatness that He rejects definitively the belief so popular in His time that suffering is a sign of

special guilt either of the sufferer or of his progenitors, and that affliction is the punishment due to sin. This idea inherited from the Old Testament, which in turn derived it from the fears of the natural man, held the Jewish world in its firm grasp and added unspeakable misery to a life hard enough to bear at the best. Judaism saw in the fall of a tower, the convulsions of a demoniac, the bloody deed of a tyrant, a divine judgment, and thereby added grievously to the misery of the innocent. It is this that gives point and urgency to Job's expostulations against the wrongs that he endures. The very intensity of the Hebrew belief in the omnipotence of God deepened and darkened the mystery of pain. We see it reflected even in the words of the great prophet of the Exile when, speaking of the suffering Servant, he says: 'It pleased Jahve to bruise Him, He hath put Him to grief.' Thus the prophet traces the wrongs and sorrows of ideal Israel to a direct, divine causation, burdens imposed upon the Servant rather than gladly and voluntarily assumed by Him. The emphasis laid on the causal connection between sin and suffering is seen in the saying of the Rabbis: 'There is no sick man healed of his sickness until his sins have been forgiven him.'[1]

Jesus does not deny that sin always implies suffering, but He does deny that suffering always implies sin on the part of the sufferer or of his kin. He teaches that suffering and sin belong to the kingdom of evil and are opposed to the fundamental will of God. He is at one with modern medical science in declaring that disease is an evil. The fact that man can rise above it, can even make it a minister of good, is no argument against its mischievous and injurious character any more than the sublime by-products of war make its waste of life other than a disaster to mankind. Christ would have us see that health is normal, disease abnormal. 'I am come,' He says, 'that ye might have life and have it abundantly.' Man is meant to realize his highest potencies, physical, mental and spiritual. Any force hostile to this scheme of normal existence is an evil and should not be.

Our Lord's doctrine of suffering was the natural and inevitable inference from His doctrine of God. Transcendent power and boundless love — such is the God whom He proclaimed. But how could such a God be conceived as the source and origin

[1] Schöttgen, quoted by Swete in *Comm. on St. Mark*, ii, 5.

of disease and the pain and wretchedness it involves? Christ's conception of God's Fatherhood makes such a thought intolerable. And modern knowledge confirms His intuition. Can we believe that from the infinite Spirit 'from whom cometh every good and every perfect gift' there rain down myriads of bacilli to maim, torture and kill the creatures whom He, out of His love, has called into existence? An ancient, under the influence of imperfect conceptions of the Divine, might say: 'If we receive good at the hands of God, shall we not also receive evil?' But the Christian must say: 'No; from God we receive good and only good.'

Hence Jesus appears at the very beginning of His ministry as a Healer of disordered bodies and souls, and if we accept the testimony of the First Gospel, He spent a portion of His time in the same gracious work even under the shadow of death in Jerusalem. The blind, the deaf, the lame, the victims of dark obsessions, men and women distressed by the miseries of others, naturally gravitated to Him, and, as the records show, He comforted and healed them. What was the motive that urged Him to give so much of His time and energy, when both were so precious, to lifting the burden of disease from the bodies and souls of men? Surely not to glorify Himself or to prove His supernatural authority. There is little evidence in the Synoptic Gospels for the idea that He ever worked a healing wonder for any apologetic purpose whatever. It is true that in the story of the man 'sick of the palsy' He is represented there as working the cure in order to prove His claim to forgive sins. But there are great difficulties in the narrative, as it has come down to us, and modern scholarship sees in it signs of later reflection. The most we are justified in asserting is that behind the present form of the story there was indeed an act of healing, and that this act may have given rise to a controversy about forgiveness. Neither His friends nor His enemies regarded His wonderful cures as proofs of His Messianic claim. His healing work was not exacted from Him by the unspiritual cravings of His people, as some critics suppose. The motive that impelled Him shines forth in the story of His life. His love to God and to man found expression in delivering the oppressed from the anguish of pain and disablement. His faith in God was such that here, as else-

where, He felt within Himself power to remove mountains. His gift of healing and the will to exercise it — these were the instruments of His perfect love.

Now it is His healing ministry that gives us the key to His view of suffering. All the more strange is it that in recent works dealing with the problem of pain in the light of Chrstianity, His therapeutic activity is scarcely mentioned, or at most is dismissed with a superficial sentence, yet it is in His vocation as Healer that His doctrine of suffering is most clearly taught. First of all, there is the striking fact that apparently He never asks whether the sufferer is worthy or unworthy, pious or wicked, or whether the sickness is needed for the purgation of the soul.[2] It is enough that the individual cries out in his distress, or that another intercedes for him, and at once the compassionate energies of Christ's will are awake and go forth to do their blessed work. Suffering imposed on the individual He believes to be incompatible with the life which God has ordained for man. 'Ought not—was it not morally fitting that—this woman whom Satan hath bound these eighteen years, should have been loosed from this bond?' Nevertheless His procedure is not that of a magician who would work wonders as by a wave of the hand. He requires faith on the part of the sufferer or of those near Him. Not only so, but if we are to judge by the curing of the epileptic boy at the foot of the Mount of Transfiguration, He, in some cases at least, asks for information about the natural duration of the disorder. He would make a simple and elementary diagnosis. In the act of curing the patient, He differs from the exorcists of His day in that He utters no elaborate formulas, makes no mysterious signs, appeals to no occult powers or angelic hierarchies. His word, reinforced by His penetrating gaze, or the touch of His hand, is simple and sublime.

As Matthew Arnold says: 'His action is like the grace of Raphael or the grand style of Pheidias; but it is above common, low-pitched nature; it is a line of nature not yet mastered or followed out.' This simplicity and directness of His method

[2] *Cf.* Harnack, *What is Christianity?* (p. 60). 'Jesus makes no division of evils into compartments and groups; He spends no time in asking whether the sick one deserves to be healed. He nowhere says that disease is salutary and that evil is a blessing.'

springs from the unity of His nature achieved through absolute dependence upon and unreserved trust in the guiding hand of God. All healing, Jesus would say, comes from God, let it come through what channel it may. 'I am but His instrument. The Father has been healing hitherto and I heal.' Thus we may say that His healing ministry is a revelation of one aspect of the Divine Fatherhood. Were it excised from the Gospels, as some critics apparently desire, one of God's most gracious attributes would remain under an eclipse, and a mighty incentive to belief in His power and willingness to help in time of need would be no longer at hand. It is this truth that Christian Science is groping after when it asserts strangely that God cannot know suffering whereas we mortals can. Physical or spiritual disorder cannot exist in the presence of perfect goodness or blessedness. Wherever God is, life is, and nothing hostile to life can be. But such an unqualified statement makes suffering impossible to God. He cannot know even the suffering implied in sympathy, and the Cross of Christ in this newest religion is thereby made of none effect. It is curious to recall that Celsus in the second century rejected Christianity as a degradation of religion because of its emphasis on a suffering God. Yet we feel that this mystery is the secret of the power of our religion. 'In Christ,' says Pascal, 'all contradictions are reconciled.' Christ is a unique Healer; He is also a unique Sufferer. The suffering He endured was incidental to His work in a sinful world. As Frederick Robertson says somewhat rhetorically, 'He approached the whirling wheel of this world's evil and was torn in pieces.' But if this means that He was the victim of an inevitable fate, we must say that the great preacher's intuition has failed him here. As the author of the Fourth Gospel said with deeper insight, Christ had power to lay down His life and power to take it again. It was suffering freely accepted in the discharge of His redeeming mission that made Christ's life and death the great atoning force in history. The necessity for His death was moral and spiritual, and because of it He turned His back on His loved Galilee and 'set His face stedfastly to go to Jerusalem,' there to crown with His sacrifice His life of self-devotion. His mission was to bring in the Kingdom, but without the shedding of His blood the Kingdom could not advance. The cup of suffering which His Father

permitted Him to drink became in His hands a vessel of life, an abiding consolation for the sin-sick and the sorrow-laden. This freely-willed offering of Himself on the altar of human need has transformed the evil into an abiding instrument of good. The Father stands aside and makes no sign while wicked men mock and crucify His Son. He allows evil to have its way, for He knows that the hour of its triumph is the hour of its defeat. Man's crime and passion are made to achieve the divine purpose. They become the very means by which His grace can stir the conscience and win the heart of the sinful and the despairing.

The 'word of the Cross,' then, is that pain and anguish, opposed as they are to the divine order, can yet subserve the cause of goodness in the world. St. Paul's experience is a classic illustration. His 'thorn in the flesh' no form of prayer could remove. He had gifts of healing; others he could help, himself he could not help. And all the skill of his friend and physician, St. Luke, availed nothing. The 'thorn' was left to inflict its pain and humiliation. Yet the cause to which the Apostle had given his heart was to gain by the spectacle of a soul transcending the inadequacies of the body through the consciousness of contact with a higher world. Through the prayer of faith, pain though itself an evil is transmuted into a good. Nevertheless St. Paul exercised the gifts of healing and even mentions it among the *charismata* of the new dispensation, whereby it is clear that he viewed diseases as something out of harmony with the divine order of life. And herein he followed in the footsteps of his Master.

When Jesus sent forth His disciples to announce the coming Kingdom, He charged them also with a commission to heal the sick. Was His word of merely temporary significance? The early Church did not so interpret it. A great factor in the triumph of Christianity was its power to face the belief in demons which was universal in the Roman Empire, and to deliver from their bondage. As Irenaeus, quoted by Eusebius, observes: 'Some disciples drive out demons so that those who have been cleansed from evil spirits frequently believe and unite with the Church. Still others heal the sick by the laying on of hands and restore them to health.' To-day we live under far different conditions. In a very real sense the medical profession are the ser-

vants of Christ and medical science the handmaiden to religion. The individual physician may be unable to call himself a Christian or even a believer in God. That need not disturb us. His calling when conscientiously discharged is a revelation of the Spirit of Christ, and is therefore a continuation of His healing ministry. Does this fact, however, free the Church from hearing and obeying Christ's command to His disciples? I cannot believe that it does. The physician is not primarily a teacher of religion and ethics; he is concerned in the main with physical states and remedies. The function of the religious and ethical teacher is to bring to bear upon the sick spiritual motives and forces which make for health and well-being. For it is the discovery of our time that man is neither body nor soul, but a third something constituted by the unity of both. Therefore the old notion that the ministry of the body belongs to the physician and the ministry of the soul to the priest is based on a false conception of the relations of the psychical to the physical. There was a time when religion and medicine were at one. By inevitable development they became independent of each other, with the result that religion was tainted by superstition and medicine became materialistic. A reconciliation of these two beneficent powers would mean a great increase of effectiveness in both, with consequent increase of blessing to mankind.

RELIGION IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

By a Housemistress (ex).

IN former days it was very usual for young adults to find themselves at one time or another in the throes of religious doubts and questionings. Those who were fortunate enough to possess a friend of sufficient insight and spiritual capacity to help them usually however, emerged in time on to more or less firm ground.

Nowadays the problem is a different one. Owing to the advanced nature of modern education, girls and boys, especially the former, begin to think seriously about religion at a much earlier age. From about fifteen onwards the minds of the more

thoughtful are frequently occupied with an incipient search after Truth. Many of these young people long for help, often hunger for spiritual food. And often they hunger in vain. This is not because there is no one who cares to help them, but because there are so few who can. Excellent syllabuses abound for the teaching of Scripture, trained and even learned teachers carry them out, but the hunger often remains.

The boys and girls of to-day, though pleasure-loving chiefly because pleasure is so easy to obtain, are in reality as serious-minded as those of former generations. And these modern young people are a great deal more exacting and critical about the facts and ideas presented to them. Many, perhaps the majority nowadays, receive little real religious teaching at home, and only a minority of the clergy really convey anything satisfying to the half-grown mind; so that for a very large number of children the training and building up of an inner life is largely an affair of chance. Some struggle to find light in their Scripture lessons and usually fail. The Bible is studied, often in great detail, much is explained to them, and very often much is explained away that had better have been left. And only too often, so far as guidance for the inner life is concerned, these girls and boys go empty away.

Some adolescents of course are satisfied with a very simple faith demanding no great mental effort, and some seem hardly awake to the need of a faith of any kind. But the majority do, at times anyhow, feel the call of the Spirit, and only too many of them lay the whole subject aside at last for lack of the guidance their young minds need. Books exist, in large numbers, written by men and women of learning, and deep spiritual experience, books full of modern thought and carefully weighed application of Christian ethics to modern life. But do those who undertake to teach Scripture read enough of such books as those of F. R. Barry, or Evelyn Underhill, or W. R. Inge or others of their type of thought? Or is the Scripture lesson intended only as a study of the Bible, chiefly from an historical and literary point of view?

The study of the Bible is, of course, of the greatest importance, but it is not enough; and doctrinal teaching can only be given in certain types of school. There is, however, a form of

religious teaching that requires a very extensive study of the Bible, that is in no sense doctrinal, and that suffices just in so far as the spiritual conviction of the teacher enables her to impart it. It is the view of religion known as Mysticism, universal in its adequacy, impelling in its invitation to thought, in its relevance to our own age, and in its utter sanity.

Young mistresses especially, straight from their colleges or early posts, well read in many ways, well taught, full of self-confidence and, as they consider, of modern enlightenment, are very apt to do harm when they begin to teach Scripture. Not uncommonly, in their desire to sweep away crude and superstitious beliefs, they deprive the young of the faith they have, without being able to give them anything adequate in its place. No doubt these young teachers are warned of the possibility of this error during their training; but they fall into it nevertheless, for the simple reason that they cannot help it. Many of them have, as yet, nothing real to give, no living burning faith that vitalizes their own life and would radiate inevitably upon their pupils. And yet without it the teacher's touch upon the religion of the young is not only valueless but dangerous.

The fact is that few people are fitted to teach this subject, the most vital of all, and there is a great reluctance on the part of many teachers to attempt to do so. This is to the good, so far as it goes, for it should be entrusted only to those who in addition to the necessary learning, feel a burning desire to convey the faith that is in them.

The person best fitted by weight of position is of course the Head (except when a clergyman takes it). And where the Head is fitted also by personal conviction and spiritual understanding the results are happy. Many Heads do teach Scripture but many, unfortunately, have not what may be called the living touch. In actual fact few young adults do have it, which is one of the many arguments against the appointment of very young Heads. They cannot give what they have not got, and, generally speaking, some real experience of the stress and strain of life is necessary to the awakening of a keen spiritual consciousness.

In some large schools a compromise is effected. One or more Scripture specialists gives instruction throughout the school,

the Head taking a little of the upper form work and giving a few extra classes to Confirmation candidates. This plan works well if and only if the specialists have that 'living touch,' if and only if the Head herself has it. This last condition is the most important of all, for a very definite reason. The young are apt to be somewhat rigid in their classifications. In their view, for example, no one but the History specialist knows any History worth mentioning, the teacher of English could hardly be asked to lend a hand with Arithmetic, and so on. And the specializing of religious teaching has a tendency to make children look upon it merely as a subject and one connected mainly with particular people, instead of as the basic conception of life, as the very fabric of daily existence and the vital concern of each and all. How is this to be reconciled with the specialist teaching which so important a subject demands? Probably in one way only, and that is by the personal influence of the Head and by her choice of staff. Obviously it is not possible, especially in a large school, to appoint to the staff only persons to whom religion is the centre of life, but if the Head herself has found, at least to some extent, 'the Pearl of Great Price,' she will tend to gather round her people of the same outlook. If the whole atmosphere of the school is one in which religion counts not only for something, but at bottom, for everything, then the actual teaching of this subject will probably be best left to those who have made a particular study of it.

So, in the end, the religious outlook of the school rests upon the personality of the Head, and to trace the matter to its source, upon the character and outlook of the bodies who appoint the Head. What in fact do these bodies look for in their choice of a candidate? High scholastic attainments naturally, training probably, a reasonably good appearance and manner, a suitable personality and also experience. But experience of what? Of teaching undoubtedly, of other sides of life, perhaps. This is all necessary and right as far as it goes, but it is not the whole story. Is any enquiry made as to the religious outlook of the candidate, beyond ascertaining the fact that she is, for example, Church of England, which may mean anything or everything or nothing? Can one imagine the members of a selecting committee asking a candidate such questions as the following :

(1) Have you ever had any real religious experience? If so, can you and are you willing to tell us anything about it?

(2) Have you any views or conceptions about Reality, Personality, Love, Prayer?

Such questions are not at all likely to be asked nor even thought of. And yet they are of the very stuff of reality. All the more obvious qualifications are carefully adjudged, but the fundamentals of character, being much harder to estimate, are largely taken for granted. And yet the whole philosophy of life of a Headmistress (or Headmaster) is of vital importance to the school. Is she (or he) going to train children only or mainly for worldly success, or is she going to train personalities which in the after life will wear, it may be, the bodies that their own deeds and words and thoughts have built up through the years? Is she going to administer a school in which spiritual values are put first or one in which an expression of 'civilized pain,' as someone wittily put it, will cross the faces of teachers and children if anyone mentions the name of Jesus Christ outside a Scripture lesson? Is she, in fact, living a spiritual life herself, and is she going to help those under her to live spiritual lives too?

It is the mental and moral atmosphere of the school that counts most of all, and this depends almost entirely, in the long run, on the Head. If the life of the school rests upon a living faith its activities will flourish, in spite of the ups and downs inevitable in all human undertakings. But if religion is not at the root of the common life, the school will fail in those things that matter most, for it will be built upon sand. The actual teaching of Scripture is, as has been said, probably best left to specialists, but, unless the whole school life is impregnated with the spirit of religion, the teachers will teach in vain, and the children, whether they know it or not, will go heart-hungry out into the world.

PERSONAL SURVIVAL AND THE IMAGINATION

By Gamaliel Milner, M.A., author of *The Problem of Decadence* and *The Threshold of the Victorian Age.*

I DO not propose to begin this paper by offering any sort of proof of the immortality of the soul. It would be a task for which I feel that I have no qualification. Frankly, I do not believe that I could demonstrate it to anyone who doubted it, unless they were willing to grant me certain postulates which are no more self-evident than the immortality of the soul; for example, the existence of a personal and benevolent Deity. Socrates himself does not seem to have been quite certain about the matter, for he says that we seem to require some divine revelation. The arguments which he advances do not carry complete conviction to minds not predisposed to accept his conclusions; we are less impressed by them than by the firm resolution of the wisest of the Greeks to stake his all upon the hope of eternal life. Possibly we may think that the revelation which Socrates desired has been vouchsafed to us. But the evidence for the truth of revelation is not such as will compel belief in those unwilling to concede it. And even to those who are willing, and more than willing, it seems sometimes to fall short of demonstration. 'Do you not think, sir,' asked Boswell of Dr. Johnson, 'that the evidence for the truth of the Christian religion is amply sufficient?' 'I could wish for more, sir,' replied the redoubtable champion of orthodoxy.

There may at least be claimed on behalf of a belief in the existence of the soul after death something like a general consensus of mankind. *Securus iudicat orbis terrarum* was the dictum of St. Augustine; the canon of faith laid down by St. Vincentius of Lerins is, What has been accepted always, everywhere, by everyone. St. Augustine and St. Vincentius gave, in fact, a decidedly restricted meaning to the terms *orbis* and 'by everyone'; the world meant in practice the Christian world, and it was not all men but all Christians, not to say all orthodox

Christians, who gave their warrant to the Vincentian rule of faith. For the doctrine of survival we are able to appeal to a greater cloud of witnesses, to men far distant in time and space and modes of thought from ourselves. In that dark backward and abysm of time which we call the palaeolithic age, the hunters, ignorant of metals, not yet accustomed to till the ground, without domestic animals except the faithful dog, buried along with their dead the weapons and the garments which were to equip him for his life in the happy hunting fields beyond. We are all aware that there have been and are those who reject the notion of survival, but, unless prejudice deceives me, it is not a doctrine which the average man tends to reject unless it be in obedience to the dictates of some theory of materialism or in revulsion from some foolish or frightful conception of the after-world.

What the average man asks to-day is, perhaps, not Will anything of me survive? but What part of me is it which will survive death? And closely connected with this question is that other, What is the character of the future life which I or that part of me which survives shall live? Most preaching on the subject to-day suffers from a distressing vagueness. The old imagery has been worn threadbare, and people are tired of being told that the old pictures of Heaven and Hell are not to be taken literally. We need new myths about a future state, by which I mean parables which give us, not the very form of things unseen, for that we cannot have in our present state of existence, but such shadowing-forth of eternal realities as might grip the imagination of the common man.

Naturally I do not feel myself competent to the task which would require the genius of a Plato or the imagination of a Dante, the construction of a picture of a future life. That there is a demand for such a myth is shown by the vogue of Spiritualism with its revelations, mostly trivial, inept and prosaic enough, of the occupations of those who have passed over to the Beyond. The sounding brass and tinkling cymbals of the séance, the vacuous garrulities of the illustrious departed, do not satisfy our appetite and provoke the caustic comment of the balladist, 'I never knew the dead could talk such rot!' One can only suppose that the defunct, having all eternity before them, do

not mind wasting their time and ours in watery declamation and vague sentimentality. But that men and women, and not always foolish men and women, 'should seek unto them that have familiar spirits and unto wizards that peep and that mutter' is pathetic evidence of desire unsatisfied.

Let us see what picture of the Hereafter men have formed for themselves in the past. We will take first what we may call the primitive or pagan notion of the dim world of shades. It is no very cheerful one. 'Rather would I be,' says Achilles, 'the thrall of a landless hind on earth than be emperor of all the shades below.' Odysseus, by the direction of the sorceress Circe, sails to the far-off western land where dwell the souls of the dead. He passes the land of the Cimmerians (to be identified perhaps with Great Britain) 'shrouded in mist and cloud, where never does the shining sun look down on them with his rays, but deadly night is spread over miserable mortals.' To Erebus he comes, the house of Hades, the strong warden of the gate, who suffers no soul to depart from his gloomy portals. The ghosts are bloodless, and to the early Greek, as to the Hebrew, the blood is the life, and without it there is but a pale shadow of existence. The hero sacrifices sheep, and the ghosts come to drink the blood to regain, if but for a brief space, some of the vigour which they had when they yet walked beneath the light of day. He sees his mother. 'Thrice I sprang towards her and was minded to embrace her; thrice she flitted from my hands as a shadow or even as a dream.' 'Even on this wise,' she tells her son, 'it is with mortals when they die. The sinews no more bind together the flesh and the bones, but the great force of burning fire abolishes these, and the spirit like a dream flies forth.' Yet the life of the shades is not without its pale compensations; law and order are maintained by Minor, glorious son of Zeus, wielding a golden sceptre, giving sentence from his throne to the dead. Hunting still goes on: 'I marked the mighty Orion driving the wild beasts together over the mead of asphodel, the very beasts that himself had slain on the lonely hills'—their ghosts, that is to say, for beasts according to Homer have souls as well as men. Companionship of friends is not wanting; Odysseus meets Achilles with his beloved Patroclus, of whom he had said while yet in the upper air, 'Yea, though in Hades'

realm the dead by the dead are forgotten, Yet will I even in death remember my dear Patroclus.' Nor can it be said that the ethical element is completely excluded; grievous sinners are punished—we have the well-known legends of Tantalus and Sisyphus. Such is, in Bible phrase, the house appointed for all living.

There is for a favoured few an earthly paradise, to which Proteus tells Menelaus he shall find admission, 'for thou hast Helen to wife, and thereby they deem thee to be son of Zeus'; in fact, as Lord Palmerston declared with much approval of the Order of the Garter, there was no merit about it. This happy isle is 'the Elysian plain and the world's end, where is Rhadamanthys of the fair hair, where life is easiest for men. No snow is there, nor great storm, nor any rain; but always Ocean sendeth forth the breeze of the shrill West to blow cool on men.'

If we turn from Homer, the Bible of the Greeks, to the Old Testament, we find pictures of the under-world not so very dissimilar. To Job it is a land of darkness, as darkness itself; and of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is as darkness. Perhaps, however, Job's ideas of a future life are coloured, as his view of this life is coloured, by the overwhelming catastrophe which has befallen him. Gloomy as is the picture of a future state which was present to the mind of the Hebrews, the clouds had their silver lining. Men were gathered to their fathers, they slept with their fathers; clan life still went on, even family life. 'I shall go to him,' says David of his infant child. (I find it difficult to believe that this means simply 'we shall both of us be buried.') In Isaiah's vision of the King of Babylon descending into the world of the dead, the kings of old time sit on their thrones in spectral dignity, and their hearts are moved with joy that the scourge of earth is brought down to the sides of the pit.

This primitive belief in a sort of ghostly half-life still haunts the imaginations of simple men even in our own times, and intrudes into the consciousness of the cultured and the devout. It is not only in the most high and palmy state of Rome that the sheeted dead squeak and gibber in the streets; every village in our own country has its ghost stories in which the spirits of the dead, clad in their shrouds, haunt the places where they have

been murdered or committed suicide. The B.B.C. the other day thought it worth while to devote an hour or two to the noises, or, as it turned out, the absence of noises, of a haunted house. I have known many respectable and religious people, clergymen as well as laymen, always refer to their deceased friends or relatives as 'poor Mr. Smith,' or 'poor Mr. Jones,' or 'my poor Father,' or 'my poor Mother,' even when the aforesaid Smith or Jones or the deceased parents had died in the odour of sanctity. The same attitude toward the dead is displayed in what has been called the most typically English of poems, Gray's 'Elegy in a Country Churchyard.'

'For who, to dumb forgetfulness a prey,
This pleasing anxious being e'er resigned,
Left the warm precincts of the cheerful day
Nor cast one longing, lingering look behind?'

'Can storied urn or animated bust
Back to its mansion call the fleeting breath?
Can honour's voice provoke the silent dust,
Or flattery soothe the dull cold ear of death?'

Save for a rather perfunctory and somewhat ambiguous reference in the last stanza, there is no allusion to immortality in this great poem which we have all learnt at school. Such is the pagan idea of death, not yet extinct for all our boasted progress.

A not unnatural reaction from this cheerless view of a futile prolongation of existence was a denial more or less confident of the future life altogether, such a denial as we find in the book of *Ecclesiastes*. The Sadducees, the conservative party among the Jews in the time of our Lord, had apparently dropped the belief in Sheol, and believed neither in angels nor spirit. The ordinary attitude of the educated classes among the Greeks and Romans seems to have been one of agnosticism verging toward denial. Epigrams and epitaphs show that while the old beliefs maintained a certain hold on the imagination, and the old ritual was kept up as a sign of piety toward the departed, annihilation or the loss of conscious existence was accepted by many, if not by most, as the lot of the soul.

'Soles occidere et redire possunt;
Nobis cum semel occidit brevis lux
Nox est perpetua una dormienda.'

From early times, how early none can say, the mind of man has revolted against the melancholy and colourless conception of the world of the dead. The revolt may be said to take two lines, or to proceed from two sources. The first is a conviction felt by most men only in moments of exaltation that the soul is derived from, or has kinship with, the divine, and therefore is, at least potentially, immortal. Transitory and evanescent as such moments of ecstasy may be, he who by faith has seen things which are invisible, has had a glimpse from the Delectable Mountains of the Celestial City, even if he be disobedient to the heavenly vision, can never quite forget it; the memory continues to haunt his imagination. This was the line of approach toward a belief in immortality which was followed by the greatest intellects in Greece and Palestine. The chief difference between Hellas and Israel was that the former proceeded from the notion of the dignity and worth of the human soul, the latter from a profound sense of the loving kindness of God. Plato deliberately inverts the traditional conception of the soul as the shadowy image of the bodily self; it is the body, on the contrary, that is the *eidolom* or shadow of the soul. Its future destiny is described by Plato in myths, that is to say, half allegorical narratives shadowing forth the shapes of things unseen. In all these narratives appear the judgment after death, rewards and purificatory punishments, reincarnation in human or animal form, and for the sage, the just and valiant man, the true lover, the eventual return to the heavenly sphere of the soul cleansed from the stain of mortality. The subtle humour of Socrates forbids a too literal interpretation, but in the *Apology* he seems to anticipate a very definitely personal existence, and thinks what tremendous fun it will be to cross-examine the souls of departed worthies, as he had done his fellow-citizens at Athens.

Israel reached the conception of a joyful resurrection by a somewhat different route. The great truth which Israel was commissioned to teach mankind was the supremacy of God. We are told that in early days the underworld was regarded as outside the sphere of the power of Jehovah. Eschatology is usually the last aspect of religion to be affected by progressive ideas, but the limitation was too obviously at variance with the religion of prophet and psalmist always to persist. ‘ In his hands are all the

deep places of the earth,' says one psalmist; 'If I go down to hell thou art there also,' says another. That great religious genius, Jeremiah, rose to the conception of religion as meaning communion with God; since God is eternal, friendship with God means a bond which death itself cannot break.

There is another line of approach to a belief in a future life, the feeling that God is just, and that here or elsewhere men must receive the due reward of their deeds. Shall not the judge of all the earth do right? For a long time Israel valiantly strove to believe that earthly prosperity waits on righteousness. In the end, especially after the Captivity, facts were too strong for them. The culmination was reached when, under Antiochus Epiphanes, faithfulness to God meant martyrdom. So we reach the contrasting conceptions of Heaven, the reward of the righteous, and Hell the place of punishment of the wicked. To the Utilitarian theologians of the eighteenth century the principal use of religion was to enforce morality by sanctions, happiness or misery in a future state. Professor Pringle-Pattison in his lectures on Immortality says (page 173), 'Punishment is not an end in itself; it can be rationally defended only so far as it seeks to reform the criminal or, failing that, to secure the community against the repetition of that particular kind of crime.' If this dictum be accepted, eternal punishment, even in the attenuated form in which it is maintained by von Hügel, seems inadmissible. Speaking for myself, I should hesitate to accept this pronouncement or to exclude the notion of retribution, which seems to be very deeply embedded in our moral consciousness and in Christian theology.

If I myself reject the doctrine of eternal punishment as usually defined, it is in the first place because I do not understand how finite crimes could deserve an infinite punishment. Moreover, I have not met or even read of people bad enough to deserve an eternity of torment. A Roman Catholic writer whom I was reading the other day, who maintained the doctrine while attempting to minimise it, said that Catholics would not assert that any particular individual was damned, except Judas Iscariot. But even with regard to Judas, do we not all experience a certain feeling of revulsion when we read that he said, after casting down the thirty pieces of silver in the Temple, 'I have sinned

in that I have betrayed the innocent blood'? And when his sacerdotal tempters callously reply, 'What is that to us? See thou to that,' and he rushes out and hangs himself, do we not experience a certain feeling of pity? Are we then more merciful than God? That there may be punishment, terrible punishment, for sin unrepented of in this life I am ready to accept, and, no doubt, I should be more ready if I had a deeper sense of the enormity of sin and of the holiness of God; but punishment without end seems to me inadmissible, a contradiction of the first principle of our religion, the loving fatherhood of God.

The notion of retributive punishment for deeds done in the body is common to the religions of many nations. In Plato's Vision of Er wild flaming figures seize upon incurable sinners as they endeavour to escape, bind them hand and foot, flay them with scourges, drag them by the wayside, and card them like wool upon thorn bushes. Usually, however, Plato represents tortures in a future state as of a temporary and purifying nature. So also does Virgil: in his account of the descent of Aeneas into the underworld he says:

> 'And some are hung to bleach upon the wind;
> Some plunged in waters, others purged in fires,
> Till all the dregs are drained, and all the rust expires.'

In the Egyptian *Book of the Dead* we see the grim hippopotamus-like monster who is to devour the guilty souls, and on Etruscan tombs the hideous figure of Charon, a figure with flaming eyes and savage aspect, who might have come straight from the Inferno of the Christianised Etruscan Dante. In Buddhist temples in China and Ceylon there are representations of hells which would do credit to the imagination of the author of the *Divine Comedy* or the designers of mediaeval frescoes, and it is probable that the fear of these abodes of woe, temporary though they are, has more influence on the ordinary Singalese peasant than any hope of attaining to Nirvana.

Fear is so much more powerful an influence on the average human being than hope, that in ancient and modern times the denial of a future life has been presented to and accepted by some men as good tidings of great joy, a deliverance from a horrid nightmare which darkened all their earthly life. Lucretius at the begin-

ning of his *De Rerum Natura* hails Epicurus as the godlike man whose mind had penetrated to the flaming bulwarks of the world and had cast beneath his feet the roar of burning Acheron, and made humanity the equal of the gods. And in modern times there have been men willing to accept the idea of annihilation and to barter what seems to them a slender hope of heaven for the certainty of escape from hell. And if what the great French preacher says about the small number of the saved be true, and if, as St. Chrysostom affirms, the number of bishops who may be saved bears no proportion to the number who will certainly be damned, there is something to be said for this point of view, and the comforts of irreligion may seem to many greater than the comforts of religion. But the natural sanity of man and the enlightened Christian conscience has always revolted against such extreme views, implicitly if not explicitly.

There are in the Old and New Testaments denunciations of cities and empires which seem to the inspired writers the embodiment of moral evil and opposition to God — Nineveh, Tyre, Balylon, Rome. Most terrific of all are the fulminations in the Apocalypse of St. John against the city of the Seven Hills. She is to be utterly burnt with fire. The most detailed description of the tortures of the damned to be found in the Bible refers not to sinners in general, or, as some might suppose, to quite exceptional criminals, but to those who acknowledged the divinity of the Roman Emperor, which was almost as much a matter of course as saluting Herr Hitler in modern Germany or il Duce in modern Italy. The fuliginous imagery of him who saw the Apocalypse reflects a mood, a mood of righteous indignation at the spectacle of vice and cruelty enthroned in the person of Nero. Evil in its more appalling shapes naturally rouses the flame of righteous anger, and in him who believes in a righteous God this takes form in his imagination as the fires of hell. The wrath of God has been displayed against godless cities and empires; we may yet see it displayed in awful judgment on our own civilization, but something always survives, and what is evil is swept away, not preserved in endless death in life. What is true of nations and cultures must also be true of that microcosm which we call man.

What of the other side? You might say to me, as was said to Milton by a young friend to whom he read *Paradise Lost*, 'You have said much of Paradise Lost, but what of Paradise regained?' But indeed, what can be said of that which eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither hath entered into the heart of man? The highest human imagination here fails; the piercing eye of Dante which sees with such vivid directness in the *Inferno* is dazzled with excess of light in the *Paradiso*. Mr. Clutton Brock in his *Dream of Heaven* lays special emphasis on the point that, if personal immortality is anything but a phase, we shall retain our personalities, nay, our idiosyncracies, we shall not fade away into pale ineffectual angels. He draws a picture, which I am sure is not meant to be irreverent, of Henry James in heaven, a little detached and faintly critical, slightly bored, indeed, with the stately ritual. We shall still be ourselves, but in each one of us there is a better self which is after all our true self, which, partly by our own fault, and partly from causes which are beyond our control, never comes to maturity in this life. That it may find fulfilment in a future life is the blessed hope which is given us in our religion. Our personality can develop only through intercourse with other personalities, above all, through communion with God. Baxter, the author of *The Saints' Everlasting Rest*, says:

> 'My knowledge of that life is small,
> The eye of faith is dim;
> But 'tis enough that Christ knows all,
> And I shall be with Him.'

And for the rest, we may end with the homely words of Dr. Watts in that good old hymn, omitted, of course, from all modern hymnbooks, and set to the fine old tune, 'Sabbath New,' which Thomas Hardy so loved:

> Then I shall see and feel and know
> All I desired or wished below,
> And every power find sweet employ
> In that eternal world of joy.

IN MEMORIAM

CONWY LLOYD MORGAN, D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S

FEW men have achieved distinction so widely as Professor Lloyd Morgan who died on Friday, March 6th, at the age of 84. A brief outline of his career will suffice to show the loss which the cause of liberalism in religion has sustained. Born in London of legal stock, he received a classical education before proceeding to the Royal College of Mines where he made practical contact with the science of mining and metallurgy. During an American tour the reading of Darwin's *Voyage of a Naturalist* stimulated interest in biology. A lectureship at Rondebosch College, South Africa, in which letters and science had each a place, preceded his succession to the chair of Geology and Biology at Bristol, where the rest of his active life was to be spent. In 1887 he became Principal and in 1910 first Vice-Chancellor of Bristol University, in which office he continued until 1919.

Before retirement his chief study had been in the fields of animal behaviour and of human psychology, upon which subjects he had written frequently with an authority universally recognized. But he will be remembered more especially for the elaboration of the theory of Emergent Evolution, which is associated with his name and that of Professor Alexander. Without the ideal balance of physical, intellectual and spiritual health he could not have carried through the work which has made him illustrious. For the regularity with which he rode his bicycle along the Somerset countryside and played golf during his final period at Clifton ensured a bodily fitness which allowed mind and soul to function undisturbed. A constant communicant at Bristol Cathedral, he declared that but for the Modernist element in the Church of England he and a score of his friends would have been unable to remain as members of it. As might be expected, he was a member of the Modern Churchmen's Union, and in the year 1924 read a paper to the Conference at Oxford upon the subject of 'Autonomy of Life and Mind.' He was typical of a distinguished group of contributors to the dis-

cussion of the 'Scientific Approach to Religion' which included Professor McBride and Professor Haldane amongst others.

The delivery of the Gifford Lectures in the years 1923—1926 provided the occasion for detailed development of his doctrine of Emergent Evolution. This doctrine, which deals with creative method, may be summarized as follows :

> The go of top-level events includes that of events at lower levels subject to modification entailed by the higher substantial synthesis . . . Furthermore the new entities have respectively quite new intrinsic qualities, and quite new extrinsic qualities in relation to other entities. And this newness in each case seems just to come — to spring into being. It is, in G. H. Lewes's terminology, *emergent* and not *resultant* — that is, not merely the algebraical sum of sundry odd qualities and properties. It is something genuinely new in evolutionary advance.
>
> Now in so far as any new entity affords an instance of a constitutive plan with new intrinsic principles of self-regulation, it exemplifies autonomy . . . There is autonomy in the atom, in the molecule, in the crystal unit, and in its first cousin, the colloidal entity.
>
> When we pass from inorganic to organic entities along a specialized line of advance in the evolution of colloids, life dawns on the scene. I accept as the most probable scientific hypothesis that it has come in a manner analogous to the springing into being of the atom, the molecule, and the colloidal unit. Certain primitive physiological events are the new items of stuff which go together in a new mode of substantial unity.

The philosophy of Emergent Evolution is patient of a Christian theology. The faith of the liberal in religion, that fuller knowledge can only lead to God, is justified, but only when science and religion unite in goodwill to work out a philosophy which, necessarily incomplete because humanly conceived, shall yet not offend science or religion or cause a disastrous severance. The writer of this notice was privileged to have the companionship of the Professor on the golf links and to hear the theme of the lectures outlined during play on the green hills sloping to the Bristol Channel. If Professor Lloyd Morgan was remarkable for the maintenance of bodily vigour long after the time when most men fail in strength and for his power to fit into a comprehensive system an unusually wide range of scientific knowledge, his friends will retain as their final and lasting memory a Christian character, beautifully poised, whose charm it was to embody Henry Drummond's saying that Love is Courtesy.

R. Gladstone Griffith.

BOOK REVIEWS

CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY*

By the publication of his latest work Dr. Headlam has substantially increased the debt which the Church owes to one of its most learned bishops. The publication of a comprehensive treatise on Christian theology by one whose time is devoted to the manifold duties of a modern diocesan is a remarkable achievement, and we must offer to the Bishop of Gloucester our respectful thanks.

The book contains the substance of theological teaching given during a long period in which the author was successively Professor at King's College, London, and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford. It is intended, as we learn from the preface, as a manual of theology for those who desire to enter the Christian ministry in the Church of England. As such it will have an immediate success, and we do not doubt that it will be widely studied for many years to come. The theological student who finds himself faced with the wide requirements of the General Ordination Examination will hail with delight a single volume of less than 500 pages which deals with philosophy, Biblical knowledge, dogmatics, Church history and doctrine, apologetics, and a little Christian ethics. Does he wish to know how the Bible stands in the face of criticism? A single chapter will inform him. Is he interested in comparative religion? Let him read passages 8 to 13. Psychology? See page 31. Philosophy? It is all there in chapters vi and vii. No words are wasted. The teleological argument is presented and discussed in four pages, deism is allotted three, pantheism two, dualism three, materialism two, and emergent evolution is dismissed in four lines and two quotations. No doubt where so vast a field has to be covered the treatment cannot be other than superficial, but a book of this kind has its dangers. It is to be hoped that it will be widely read, but as an introduction, not as containing all that a theologian, or even a clergyman, needs to knonw.

The general tone of the discussion is liberal, though the conclusions are always rigidly orthodox. For instance, on the subject of miracles Dr. Headlam writes:

> 'The majority of theologians would point out and point out correctly, that for most of the miracles of the Old Testament the evidence is not good. Some people think that this is true also of New Testament miracles. I do not think that we can exclude such people from the Christian Church, or say that everyone who desires to be ordained must believe everything in the New Testament.'

And again:

> 'Both in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds there are clauses which we do not accept literally. . . . It is clear that we cannot decide dogmatically how far this principle may be carried. Some people are inclined to allow themselves and others freedom up to a certain point, and then to attempt to draw a rigid line. I do not think that such a position is possible or defensible' (p. 303).

* *Christians' Theology, the Doctrine of God.* By the Right Reverend Arthur Headlam, D.D. Bishop of Gloucester. (The Clarendon Press. 1934. 12/6.)

In view of such liberalism, the Bishop's contemptuous dismissal of 'Modernism' is somewhat puzzling.

> 'Modernism is a mere phase of thought, the product of the limited experience of a small body of people at the present day' (p. 147). 'It is always a little difficult to understand the position of the Modernist, and many Modernists are little more than bad theologians or bad historians. . . . The majority of Modernists seem to be men of confused methods of thought who have never really thought out the meaning of the language that they use' (p. 389).

A reviewer writing in Cambridge, where the term 'Modernism' is seldom heard, may be excused a certain bewilderment. What is this 'Modernism' which Oxford holds in such low esteem? Are the distinguished men whose names appear as president, vice-presidents, and members of the Council of the Modern Churchmen's Union, bad theologians, bad historians, and confused thinkers? We in Cambridge had supposed that Modernism was a temper, not a creed, and that it stood for no more than a demand for freedom to relate the fundamental truths of Christianity to the best knowledge of the day. As such, it is assumed if not paraded. Dr. Headlam must mean something else, for no better statement of the Modernist position could be desired than that which is found in the last chapter of his book. 'Christian truth demands from time to time restatement. In teaching the truths of religion it is necessary to teach them in language which harmonizes with the intellectual conceptions of the day. But these are constantly changing. . . . So all through Christian history restatements of religious truth have been necessary. The only necessity is that our restatement of religious truth should be loyal to the Christian religion,'

and the author goes on to summarize the Christian tradition in the simplest and broadest terms. No doubt there is ambiguity in the phrase 'loyalty to tradition,' and the Bishop's admiration for St. Vincent of Lerins does not suggest a liberal interpretation of evolution in the sphere of doctrine; but as we turn back to p. 83 we are reassured.

> 'The belief in Christianity is a belief in a divine revelation which gives us certain great principles of life and faith to be continually developed and applied by the inspired human reason. On no point does the original revelation give us a rule, or a formulated doctrine, or even a code of morals.'

Is not this precisely the Modernist contention?

Space forbids discussion of many interesting questions which are raised by the book, but a few points deserve mention. Philosophers will not be satisfied with Chapter vi on 'The Doctrine of God,' though it is central to the work. Apart from the impossibility of treating so great a theme in a few pages, the method is open to question. The fact of Revelation seems to be assumed, and it is then supported by reason. Such scholasticism is not satisfying at the present day. On p. 202 the omnipotence of God appears to be defined as ability to reconcile the irreconcilable. This is the kind of escape from reality of which the modern mind is justly impatient. On critical questions the author is unshakable in his conservatism, but the reader has an uneasy feeling that his reading is not quite up-to-date. In discussing the meaning of the title 'Son of Man' he betrays no acquaintance with modern work. Harnack is often referred to, but there is no mention of more recent schools of critics. Indeed there is much in the book

which suggests that the Bishop, in the midst of his many engagements, has not been able to keep abreast with the most recent scholarship. The works referred to in the notes, though numerous, are for the most part oldish books, and in general the problems discussed are those which loomed large twenty years ago.

A curious feature of the book is the almost complete disregard of Cambridge theology. Even Gwatkin, whose orthodoxy was surely unimpeachable, is dismissed in a footnote to p. 357.

> 'Those who want cleverness will find it in Harnack . . . and Gwatkin.' Neither is to be compared with 'William Bright, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church.'

How many historians would endorse this verdict?

The Bishop is perhaps least at home in the sphere of history. He deals at considerable length with the development of doctrine, but some of his judgments are hardly to be justified even by the need for brevity. For instance, the contrast between the schools of Antioch and Alexandria (p. 369) is more facile than historical.

> 'On the one side (Antioch) there are those to whom Christianity means living in the world, conforming to the world, but trying to live a life modelled on that of Christ. With them the ethical predominates.'

But Diodore, Theodore, Chrysostom, and Nestorius were all monks, though compelled by circumstances to be bishops, and their ideals were not less ascetic and world-renouncing than those of the Alexandrians. The account of Nestorius owes little to recent research. It is regrettable that the old libel of Theodotus of Ancyra that Nestorious denied the divinity of the infant Christ should appear in a modern work (p. 371). The Bazaar of Heracleides has made it clear that what he said was, 'I would not call God a child of two or three months old,' which is in line with his consistent refusal to ascribe human limitations to the Deity. On p. 375 Flavian of Constantinople, who was murdered at the second Council of Ephesus, is twice called Flavian Bishop of Antioch, who had been dead for nearly fifty years. Since Flavian of Constantinople was the recipient of Leo's Tome, this is a strange mistake.

Taken as a whole, the book is to be recommended, particularly to those who have time for wider reading. Some may be irritated by the determination of the author to adopt a conservative position without much apparent regard for the weight of evidence, and some may regret that the Professor's lectures were not published twenty years ago; but all must rejoice that the Church of England has a Bishop who can write a book at once so scholarly and so readable.

P. GARDNER-SMITH.

CLERI ANGLICANI*

*Crockford** for 1936 with its amazing collection of clerical, parochial, capitular, diocesan information has come to hand — the indispensable book where two or three of the clergy are gathered together. It is their *Who's Who* and their guide to past, present and even future ecclesiastical history, if they possess prophetic imagination. The Preface, as usual, is full of practical wisdom. We cannot, however, agree with the Editor when he writes: 'We have never felt certain that there ought to be a pension

* *Crockford's Clerical Directory* for 1936. (Oxford University Press. 42/-. India Paper, 63/-.)

scheme for widows. The Church of England does not compel its clergy to marry, but allows them to do so "at their own discretion as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness."'

In many parishes the clergyman's wife does the work of an unpaid curate added to those of organist and Sunday School teacher. If any woman is entitled to a pension from the Church it is certainly a clergyman's widow.

The Preface is written with a light, caustic touch with no cant but much ironic humour. Nevertheless, it is marked by a spirit of vigorous optimism which does not regard the Church of England as a declining force in the life of the nation. The Editor is a discerning and trenchant critic of the Church Assembly, particularly of its window-dressing and debating platitudes. He recognizes the risk that the Assembly runs in needlessly afflicting the clergy.

> 'It was admitted by several speakers that the raising of the "quota" depends upon the incumbent. We believe this to be true, and that Dean's Yard would have done well to recognize that the goodwill of the clergy is its most valuable asset. The clergy are not angels (as St. Thomas of Aquinum justly remarked), and can, therefore, hardly be expected to show very much enthusiasm for an Assembly which as far as it has affected them at all has weakened their authority, threatened their security, added to the kind of work which they were not ordained to do and made it more difficult for them to keep themselves and their parishes out of debt . . .
>
> 'Those who follow the debates in the Assembly must, we think, remember that no member of the House of Laity can know much about any ordinary parish. The fact that he is a member of the House of Laity lifts the parish to which he belongs out of the ordinary by giving its Church Council a direct link with the Assembly. There are about three hundred and fifty of these "distinguished" parishes—and nearly thirteen thousand others.'

Crockford is righteously indignant that proposals should be made to retire aged clergymen who will probably be required to retire on miserable pensions, whereas no steps are proposed to retire aged bishops for whom a quite comfortable retiring competence is provided.

Crockford is of opinion that an increase in the number of ordinands above the present annual figures is unlikely, unless as in the past a considerable number of curates possess private means and are willing to work for a nominal stipend. One of the least gratifying features in our modern Church life is the great decline in the number of clergymen of this kind. It points not only to a falling social status of the clerical order but to a decline of practical idealism in the homes of the wealthier classes in this land due to the spread of the spirit of commercialism. There are many spheres to-day of moral and spiritual work where it is impossible to provide what is called a living wage and where, if clergymen of private means are not forthcoming, the work will not be done. This is true both of the country as well as of the town. The ordaining of older men, retired naval and military officers and civil servants, possessed of pensions (on the clear understanding that they themselves should not become beneficiaries in the existing clerical pensions scheme) seems to us quite a sound procedure. Unfortunately, many of the bishops seem opposed to this. Such clergymen, in small country parishes, would be extremely useful and highly appreciated and save the deplorable union (so-called) of country benefices.

We are in entire agreement with *Crockford* in his condemnation of the injustice of the recent Tithe Rent Charge extinction proposals. Those who in many cases to-day have a very hard struggle against poverty will be harshly treated if the Commission's proposals receive the force of legislation. We very much doubt, especially as the Universities and other ancient educational institutions are being treated with similar injustice, whether the spirit of justice which dwells in our Houses of Parliament will sanction these proposals. Nevertheless, we do not feel able to exonerate the Church authorities from blame for the terms of the Act of 1925. We thought then, in view of the state of agriculture in this country, that the Church was taking from the land more than she ought to take. H.D.A.M.

PHILOSOPHY AND FAITH*

To many the words Philosophy and Faith represent alternatives rather than attitudes of mind which may unite harmoniously in one personality. Philosophy is believed to be essentially negative and critical. Faith is assumed to be some authoritative dogma leaving little opportunity for free enquiry.

Miss Emmet frankly recognises the actual tension between Philosophy and Faith but develops, in this volume, the argument that Philosophy requiries and implies a faith which can best mature within the Christian community. Taking Faith to be

> 'self-commitment in the service of something we believe to be supremely worth while' (p. 84),

it is contended that Philosophy involves a faith in the power of persuasive reasoning to reveal truth and requires a readiness to sacrifice all in following the argument wherever it may lead. Philosophy is, therefore, not merely negative but a vocation with a fundamental faith and claiming an essential freedom. In this faith and freedom philosophy undertakes the task of giving our experience 'a coherent interpretation through critical reflection' (p. 19). But our experience is the outcome of our interests. It follows that the most adequate philosophy will be 'an activity of reflective interpretation within a total life' (p. 57). Those who do not fully live cannot fully interpret life. To ignore the intuitive insight of religious experience is fatal.

> 'Religion is as it were an eye through which philosophy must try to see into the ultimate problems' (p. 107).

But the philosopher has great psychological difficulty in sharing religious experience. The solution is not to allow philosophy and religion to draw apart, but to find room for the philosopher within the Christian community. Within the community he is in touch with a great corporate tradition. The tension between prophetic religion and the slow ways of philosophical criticism will not disappear but will become a creative tension in which each plays its part in the life of the whole.

The volume provides a sane and interesting discussion of the mutual contributions of philosophy and religion. It indicates a way of growing into greater sympathy and understanding. A *modus vivendi* is by very nature not a full solution, but it may prepare the way for a reconciliation otherwise unobtainable.

G. F. Woods.

* *Philosophy and Faith.* Dorothy M. Emmet. (S.C.M. 1936. Price 4/6.)

PRAYERS ANCIENT AND MODERN*

We are grateful for the initiative of Dr. Dearmer and Canon Barry which has produced a valuable collection of prayers for use at Public Worship on various occasions. Many parochial clergy who feel themselves free, in this time of liturgical transition, to make additions to our Services which are in harmony with the spirit of the Prayer Book, will find nothing to offend and much to help in the *Westminster Prayers.*[1] Book I in this collection consists of prayers for Gifts and Graces, also for special occasions such as festivals, commemorations, elections and meetings. Book ii consists of Litanies, Special Services and Thanksgivings. From many good prayers we select the following specimen :—

THE BRITISH EMPIRE.

'Almighty Father, who hast given to our Sovereign Lord the King a great dominion on the earth : draw together, we pray, in true fellowship the nations and races which dwell therein ; that in brotherly concord they may set forward thy Kingdom, and that all may employ thy good gifts of order and liberty to the welfare of mankind and to thy glory : through Jesus Christ our Lord.

The number of books on prayer is increasing. We get them in all sizes, and consisting of many methods of prayer : prayers new and old, prayers in prose and prayers in poetry, prayers for grown-ups, prayers for children, prayers for confirmation candidates, prayers for saints and sinners, prayers for scholars and students. Every device is used to secure concentration and reality in prayer. It is a hard task.

'The price of real prayer is habitual self-discipline in thinking' (Dr. Fosdick).

'Prayer is . . . an act of devotion influencing the very depth of the soul, permeating the whole life and shaping every action. . . . This self-surrender is not an isolated act but involves a habitual and progressive discipline, a life-long "conversion" from love of self to love of God' . . . (Mrs. Herman).

What a contrast there is between these efforts and William Cowper's verse :

'Have we no words? ah, think again,
Words flow apace when we complain,
And fill our fellow-creature's ear
With the sad tale of all our care.

Were half the words thus vainly spent
To Heaven in supplication sent,
Our cheerful song would oftener be,
"Hear what the Lord hath done for me."'

These books on prayer demonstrate the importance of being in 'sane relations with the Eternal' and of understanding the methods by which that relationship can be deliberately cultivated. By prayer of the right kind we are enabled to know God (in some degree, however small) ; to be friends with Him ; to understand some of His plans for us and for others, so as to work with Him and for Him in daily contact.

[1] *Westminster Prayers,* by Canon P. Dearmer and Canon F. R. Barry. (Oxford University Press. 2/6.)

One method of prayer is by listening (instead of speaking) and the results are recorded in the little book *God Calling*[2] written by two women whose names are not given. In 1932 they began 'to listen in' to God and the messages they received are now published, one for each day in the year. Under December 5th we read:

> 'Give to all you meet, or whose lives touch yours, of your prayers, your time, yourselves, your love, your thought . . . '

This book has been edited by A. J. Russell (author of *For Sinners Only*) who declares that had he written it he would 'have been immeasurably proud' and that he has 'found these messages a spiritual stimulus.'

Canon Peter Green's method[3] is by way of meditation, adoration, confession, self-dedication, intercession and thanksgiving. He is concerned with deepening the spiritual life of the ordinary church-goer by means of prayer, and has written a little book divided up into six days for that purpose, consisting of prayers, poems and selections from the Bible. In the Preface Canon Green says:—

> 'What the ordinary Christian needs, I am sure, is a form of prayer, fixed enough to prevent vagueness and wandering thoughts, yet elastic enough to avoid monotony and to leave the soul as much freedom as possible.'

In contrast to Canon Peter Green, who makes use of the Prayer Book Collects in his compilation, Mr. Milner-White's prayers[4] are original, though they are based upon old forms of prayer, echoing 1662 English and recalling the rhythm of ancient usages. We append three specimens:—

> 'O God, whose mercy is older than our beginning, and shall outlive our mortal end: Assist us to perceive it day by day, and to magnify thee with our whole heart fervently: through Jesus Christ our Lord.'
>
> 'O God, the well of love and Father of all: Make us so to love thee that we know not but to love every man: in Jesus Christ thy Son our Lord.'
>
> 'Help us, O Holy Spirit, Giver of life and love, to be always so mindful of the love from whence we came, that we may learn more and more the love to which we go: and in this love abounding, daily abide.'

A most interesting collection of prayers, ancient and modern, beautiful in form and format has been selected and arranged for each day of the year by H. G. Tunnicliffe.[5] It includes selections from some 140 authors and sources. We note under December 5th, the prayer of Rowland Williams (1818—1870), 'teach the prayerless to pray.' This must be as difficult an accomplishment as is St. Paul's injunction, 'pray without ceasing.'

Sir Thomas Browne, for whom possibilities bulked as large as certainties, defends, in his *Religio Medici*, the practice of prayer in connection with the petty affairs of everyday life.

> ''Tis not a ridiculous devotion to say a prayer before a game at tables: for even in sortileges and matters of greatest uncertainty, there is a settled and pre-ordered course of effects. . . . Though we christen effects by their most sensible and nearest causes, yet is God

[2] *God Calling*, by Two Listeners. (James and Son, Ivy Lane, London. 3/6.)

[3] *Progress in Prayer*, by Peter Green. (S.P.C.K. Price 6d. and 1/-.)

[4] *A Cambridge Bede Book* for moments of prayer and meditation, by Eric Milner-White. (Longmans. Price 5/- net.)

[5] *The Voice of Prayer*. Prayers of the Centuries selected and arranged by H. G. Tunnicliffe. (Ivor Nicholson and Watson. Price 3/6.)

the true and infallible cause of all: whose concourse, though it be general, yet doth it subdivide itself into the particular actions of everything, and is that spirit, by which each singular essence not only subsists, but performs its religious operation.' M. E. MAJOR.

A 'UNITED FRONT' FOR CHRISTENDOM*

Dr. William Adams Brown, Principal of the Union Theological Seminary, New York, sees a need for a revival and strengthening of institutional Christianity. In his Preface to this work he expresses strong disagreement with a recent pronouncement of Professor John Dewey's (in *A Common Faith*, New Haven, 1934) to the effect that institutional religion in all its forms is negligible, not to say deleterious. What matters in religion, said Professor Dewey, is not what we believe or how we worship in detail, but the sincerity and idealism which we carry into whatever we do. Dr. Brown sees that the day for this kind of easy-going, vapid liberalism is past; it is pre-war, and cannot stand up to the tough, relentless, utterly unscrupulous, single-hearted dogmatisms of our time.

But indeed one may well ask what is the use of strengthening institutional Christianity? Each institution stands for its own particularist view, and strives to preserve its own vested interests. What is the use of infusing fresh vim into these squabblers? Surely they ought to be permitted gently to fade out? Such are the questions one is tempted to ask. If 'churchy' people—whether Methodists, Anglicans, or Romans—have no sense of proportion, and are interested chiefly in trifles, why seek to galvanise their precious churches into life? They will only make themselves ridiculous.

Dr. Adams Brown is alive to these weaknesses of the Churches. But his view is that these weaknesses must be overcome because the churches, whatever their faults, are indispensable to the individual as rallying points, as sources of energy and courage, as nuclei around which resistance to tyranny can crystallise. Churches as generators of spiritual energy, as inspirers of resistance and rebellion, are needed to-day more than ever. How else are we to fight the new barbarism, the new racial manias, the new totalitarian tyrannies? Moreover, in the gigantic mass machinery of to-day—social, industrial, governmental—the individual is lost. If he is to save his life, his soul, he will do so by combining with others who hold his values, who stand for his beliefs.

> 'During the past three years the author has travelled widely not only in Europe but in Asia and has talked with Christians of many different countries and branches of the Church; and everywhere he has found a sense of bewilderment and isolation, the consciousness that face to face with the gigantic forces of the modern world the individual by himself can do little or nothing.'

Dr. Adams Brown is not one of those who simplify the problem by declaring that the only thing needed to give the Churches a dynamic is for them to 'join up' together. Reunion may be desirable, but it will do no good if the spirit of the new comprehensive church is no different from that of the bodies it absorbs.

> 'We must perceive that the question of the unity of the Church is not simply or even primarily a question of ecclesiastical organization

* *Your Church and Mine*. By William Adams Brown. (Chapman and Hall. 1936. 10/6.)

but of the possibility, more than this, of the present reality, of a Common Christian life. It is not the existence side by side of so many independent and self-governing churches that is disturbing. It is the fact that these reflect and perpetuate attitudes towards religion which hinder spiritual fellowship and inhibit common action.'

And again:

'We must transcend our differences through a unifying purpose. We must cease to think of the Church as we have been thinking of it, as the organization through which we can realize the type of religion most congenial to each of us. We must see it as what, in God's sight, it was meant to be—His agent for the redemption of the peoples. We must no longer be content to remain Presbyterians, Baptists, Episcopalians, even Catholics or Protestants. We must become Christians in the comprehensive, but also testing, sense of the word.'

The primary object of Dr. Adams Brown's book is to examine systematically and thoroughly the differences which divide Protestants from Catholics — differences of temperament, of religious practice and sensibility. His conviction is that a proper understanding of the one side by the other is necessary and would lead to an immense strengthening and enrichment of that common Christian life which might redeem the world.

Dr. Adams Brown's book contains passages indicating both where Protestants may learn from Catholics and *vice versa*.

'As a reformer the Protestant is apt to think of authority primarily as a bond that limits his freedom. He tends to forget that it may also be a guide that directs his activity. If there is one thing more than another which we can learn from the present crisis of democracy, it is that there is something in man that responds to command. "Oh, that someone would tell us what we must do!" On this deep need of man the claim of Rome to rule the spirit of man is built. Protestants do right to protest against authority when it is imposed from without. They confess their bankruptcy when to the soul that asks for guidance they can give no clear response.'

And again, *a propos* of Catholic piety — so ill-understood by many Protestants:

'In comparing religious types we must compare the best with the best, not our own best with our neighbour's worst. At this point counsels of patience are in place. Before we criticise we must understand; and this takes an effort of the imagination for which most Protestants are unprepared. . . .

'The first thing that we note about Catholic piety is the extremely concrete, not to say naïve, way in which it finds expression. It is mediated by physical objects . . . Catholic religion is accessible religion. Through its symbols—and they are everywhere—it brings God near to the worshipper. It reminds him that there is another world than the world of business and pleasure in which most of our waking hours are spent.'

Dr. Adams Brown has done a great service by writing this plea for mutual understanding between the Churches. The book is a most exhaustive treatise, and deserves the careful attention of Christians of all denominations. Its optimistic and courageous spirit are also to be commended in these days of ecclesiastical defeatism.

J. C. Hardwick.

MODERNISTS AND SACRAMENTS*

This small book on the sacraments has as a sub-title *A Modernist Explanation*, but the author expressly disclaims any intention of making an *ex-officio* pronouncement for Modernism and would agree with the words in Dr. Major's Introduction:

> 'It is not the conclusions which make the Modernist but the love of freedom and truth, tolerance and comprehensiveness.'

Once this is acknowledged, we can go on without misunderstanding to welcome this book as an interesting and useful attempt to grapple with a difficult subject. If his book does not reach the goal of a satisfactory modern interpretation, yet it travels in the right direction. The road is perhaps rather bumpy and at times the reader may feel a further revision of the text might have eased the journey not a little, but it seems ungracious to make such complaint when we are taken not down well-known roads but along tracks recently blazed by pioneers. There is here wide knowledge of the journeys of other travellers and an honest and adventurous spirit.

Like other Modernists, the author shows a profound interest in the remote past. Most of the book is concerned with the problem of the Dominical institution of the sacraments, with their relation to the Mystery religions and with the sacramental teaching of the Fourth Gospel. These are highly technical and difficult problems, and others besides the reviewer will here learn what perchance they have forgotten or perchance never knew. Slighter references are made to the doctrines of the mediaeval schoolmen and the Reformers. The whole argument is set in the author's symbolistic metaphysic which is elaborated mostly in the last chapter. Possibly the 'average intelligent enquirer into the Christian religion,' to whom reference is made in the opening sentence, could do with a little less history and a little more and clearer metaphysics, together with fuller suggestions for the revision of our sacramental forms of worship. However, Mr. Micklewright has judged otherwise.

Our author regards the weight of evidence in the New Testament as against the Dominical institution of either sacrament. This does not, in his view, affect the value of the sacrament but only its doctrinal interpretation; it rules out a certain type of baptismal and eucharistic theory. Repugnant though this negative view may be, especially to those whose faith seems to rest in Jesus as the Founder of an Institution, yet there is no escaping the fact that the New Testament, seriously studied, appears to speak with an uncertain voice — even if one does not go so far towards the full negative as our author. We do not know whether Jesus 'instituted' the sacraments or not. Nor can many Modernists believe that in the tradition of the Church we have always a source of historically accurate information of events so long ago. But we may fully believe, as our author appears to do, that the Church was guided into the use of these Sacraments by the Spirit of God and is still so guided.

> 'It may well be,' writes Mr. Micklewright, 'that the development of the Holy Communion Service from the simple Kiddush meal which Jesus performed with His disciples is as closely allied as the development of the oak-leaf from the humble acorn, apparently so far removed from it.'

* *Sacraments and the Modern Man.* By F. H. Amphlett Micklewright. (Skeffington. 1935. 3/6.)

If the value of the sacraments for the Christian to-day is not much affected by whether they originated in the precise command or the inspired imitation of Jesus, equally is the Christian untroubled by the other historical question, namely, the influence of the mystery-religions on the development of the Christian sacraments. It may be true, as our author and others say, that Christianity 'somewhere and somewhen became in part a mystery cult.' Possibly the Mysteries coloured Paul's view of the efficacy of the sacraments, and this fact may be a good stick with which to beat some naïve doctrines; but what does it matter? The danger of confusing the symbol with the thing signified is always with us and so is the tendency to claim magical powers. In saying this, we would not disparage this book's account of the historical problem, for it is full and most interesting, though possibly it would gain in strength by a little more attention to those profound characteristics in which Christianity differed for the better from the Mystery cults.

Mr. Micklewright would entirely agree that we must look elsewhere than to origins alone for the proper interpretation of the sacraments. Underlying his argument is the plea for the not unfamiliar idea of the sacramental principle in the whole of life; 'the showing forth of things which are eternal and spiritual under the forms which are limited and temporal.' Like Dr. Raven, the author finds support in the Fourth Gospel for this approach, and he argues that while the writer of that Gospel knows the sacramental customs of his day, yet he deliberately omits the stories of the Baptism and the Last Supper

> 'in order to stress the eternal and non-material nature of his philosophy; the material takes its proper place as the shadow of the values which are eternal.'

There is hope of a better understanding in our Church along the symbolistic line wisely taken here; since this book was written Dr. Temple in his Gifford Lectures summed up his philosophical position in the phrase 'The Sacramental Universe.' We have already expressed the wish that this symbolism had been more precisely and fully discussed in the book under review.

On another point we must differ from our writer. He disparages the attitude which would regard sacramental worship as an extra. With Dr. Major, we are bound to emphasize that there are a large number of non-sacramental Christians. Possibly Mr. Micklewright would have realised this more fully had he given his special attention to the question of the psychology of worship in relation to differences of temperaments. The reviewer has long had a strong impression that certain persons find sacramental worship of quite special value; it seems to meet some psychological need in them for, say, concreteness, definiteness, objectivity, intense corporateness, or concentration. Not only does it appeal but it is patently beneficial. Frequent communions may be a most valuable habit and discipline for a certain type of eager and centrifugal temperament which constantly needs to be reined-in and returned to its true focus. On the other hand, others may need the stimulation of their natural sluggishness by much more varied types of worship. Other clergymen, beside the reviewer, whose duties in this epoch of our National Church lead them to considerable sacramental worship, will feel quietly convinced that this mode of worship is not psychologically — or is it spiritually? — congenial or particularly helpful. We conduct and do it gladly to meet the wishes and needs of others, but, like I believe the mass of Englishmen whose interest

in their Church has ebbed just at the time when its sacramental life has a high tide, we find a little of this sort of worship goes a long way. We deeply value it in strict moderation. We understand the Prayer Book saying, three times a year. Of course, we are willing to be persuaded. Perhaps we have been unduly influenced by the existence of notorious abuses and magical notions, and by the type of Anglo-Catholic Eucharistic devotion which at 8.0 a.m. lacks corporateness and at 11.0 a.m. lacks communion. The real parochial communion, which some few Anglo-Catholics seem anxious to establish, is another matter, and which, *pace* my Catholic friends, reminds one son of Evangelicalism of the monthly evening communions of his extreme youth. And is not monthly enough? Also those of us who are Modernists would be more attracted to the Communion Service if certain phrases, suggestive of repellent doctrines of an expiatory and substitutionary sort, were expunged from our Prayer Book and some of the more glorious teaching of the New Testament put in their place. We would have been interested in more comments by Mr. Micklewright about the Prayer Book, for though he is a historian he is not an antiquarian.

In his last chapter Mr. Micklewright firmly dissociates himself from Latin ceremonial, fasting, and celebrations at which the vast majority are non-communicants. He makes a good plea for making use of modern artistic gifts in the service of the sacraments. He claims that the Eucharist sums up the whole Christian Gospel. He emphasizes the social significance of the Service; it is 'the meal of God's commonwealth.' He also emphasizes the Holy Communion as

> 'the point of contact wherein, under outward form, the union (of the Christian with Christ) may be seen as consummated.'

There are also other aspects of the rite which provide the most ready symbolism. There is the antiquity which links the centuries, the universality which links the Churches, the association with the Upper Room which links the worshipper to the historic Jesus; there is the simple and profound symbolism of food, and the all-pervading suggestion of the heavenly and abiding, the reference to eternity. All such points the writer mentions, but does not marshall effectively.

Finally, a word must be said about the elements. Mr. Micklewright will have no transubstantiation theory. Any claim to a material change in the elements lies open, in his judgment, to the Bishop of Birmingham's challenge for someone to distinguish between consecrated and unconsecrated bread. Nor will our author accept a Receptionist view, for this, he judges, makes the rite unnecessary and meaningless. He holds the elements undergo a transvaluation:

> 'They have the symbolic value of the Body and Blood of Christ. They are the symbols which give the rite a meaning.'

Is it childish to suggest that Mr. Micklewright, like other writers on this subject, seems to overlook elementary considerations? First, when in doctrine the bread and wine have been transferred into the Body and Blood of Christ a further step in doctrine is needed by which the spiritual effectiveness of this 'Body and Blood of Christ' is described and accounted for. Secondly, surely all discussion of the elements turns on the metaphysics of the speaker, or should do; and when I can define better the relationship between myself and my desk, I shall define better the relationship between Christ and the elements. Transvaluation is doubtless better than transubstantiation and less likely to be regarded as magical by the uneducated.

Yet both lose something vital. The words of institution are poetic. For nineteen hundred years men have argued about them as though they were prose, and devitalized them with metaphysical speculations. How we cling to the belief that prose is nearer truth than poetry! Perhaps Mr. Micklewright would not approve of this unlearned opinion, but he ends his book with a little prose poem about a Communion Service in the English Church in the Tyrol; it is a lovely picture and we thank him for it.

H. G. MULLINER.

PRAEPARATIO EVANGELICA*

Some years ago Dr. Fairweather wrote *The Background of the Gospels,* which has become established as a standard text-book for students of the period between the Old and New Testaments. As the title of that work was perhaps a little misleading, so for the present supplementary volume, *The Background of the Epistles,* is an even more inadequate explanation of its substance. Out of more than 400 pages only eighty treat of the Epistles, and these simply contain admirable sketches of their Christology and pneumatic theology.

Read separately, the chapters of the book might be taken for essays of unequal merit and authority, and from the list of contents it would be hard to discover any unitary aim. But throughout the book unity is imposed by the persistently, though not obtrusively, present standpoint of the writer, who regards all previous history, whether classical or Jewish as a preparation for Christ. It is common enough for Christian writers to regard Judaism as culminating rather in the New Testament than in the Talmud, but classical scholars, accustomed to pursuing their studies departmentally, as a separate discipline, may feel a slight surprise at Dr. Fairweather's tendency to distort Graeco-Roman history as a prologue to the Incarnation. Those who hold it an axiom of history that God does not intervene in history will require some adjustment to appreciate Dr. Fairweather's Christocentric interpretation of historical events.

The author's aim is partly to provide for the increasing number of theological students whose studies are not firmly based on a classical training. But it is just those chapters that treat Graeco-Roman culture and religion which are the weakest. It is inevitable in a work of wide range that a writer should rely in part on secondary authorities, and the Jewish and Christian chapters of this book show greater knowledge and insight than the classical, which not only contain some contentious generalisations, but are unsympathetic in aim, tending rather to emphasize those defects in classical thought and culture which Christianity supplemented. Thus, it may be questioned whether the Romans really aimed at world-conquest (p. 18); the policy of the republic at all events was reluctant and vacillating. Again (p. 7):

> 'Moral genius cannot be claimed for the Hellenic race. They had little sense of original sin, and thought too lightly of moral delinquency.'

A people that raised ethics to a science might be allowed moral genius, and sin, whether original or subsequent, is a religious and not a moral term.

Dr. Fairweather does not write for beginners, and though his style is lucid, it is too compressed and full of facts to be intelligible except to those already acquainted with the outlines of later Judaism. It is perhaps better to indicate Dr. Fairweather's general position than to controvert it. He

* *The Background of the Epistles.* By William Fairweather, D.D. (T. and T. Clark. 1935. 12/- net.)

writes as a conservative Presbyterian with no love for Modernists (p. 336), and with a strong ethical bias and a dislike of eschatology, so that his attitude to the apocalyptic literature and aspirations is not very helpful. But one may protest at his attempt to have it both ways (pp. 168-9).

> 'But although the new age was not of the character anticipated in the apocalyptic writings, it did really come in the form of the Christian religion, which was inaugurated by the announcement "the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." The Christian Church had become firmly embedded in the Graeco-Roman civilisation, and found a new world in the brotherhood of believers. In this way, and with some justification, it gained the consciousness of being in itself the fulfilment of the ideas contained in the apocalypses. The New Age was not indeed that adumbrated by the apocalyptists, but their invincible hope in the future, and in the ultimate triumph of right over wrong, remains an abiding heritage and inspiration for the people of God.'

The rest of this notice may be confined to points of detail. On p. 36 it would be better, in the context, to describe Alexandra as the widow rather than as the wife of Jannaeus. It may be doubted (p. 83) if settlers planted by the Assyrians really swamped the remnant of the Northern Kingdom. Is it not rather rash to base an assertion of an orthodox Jewish belief with respect to resurrection and retribution on one passage in the late book of Daniel? Was there an orthodox Jewish belief about anything except the unity of God? Is Socrates' intrepid and generous death explicable only on the view that the soul is immortal? Dr. Fairweather accepts the patristic allegations that the mysteries travestied Christianity (p. 267), without discussing whether this be chronologically possible. On p. 278 Zoroastrianism is represented as evolving from dualism to monotheism, on p. 280 as following a reverse process. 'All true Israelites from the Mosaic period onwards were essentially monotheists' (p. 293). 'True' seems to contain a *petitio principii*. Dr. Fairweather asserts that Jewish women were more influential than pagan. Does he really believe that the position of women in Roman law was not preferable to that in the Mosaic Code? It is a little startling to find tenderness designated a Jewish quality (p. 301). Some of the exegesis is arbitrary:

> 'When the apostle describes Him as "the first-born of all creation" (Col. i, 15), the meaning is not that He was Himself a created being, but merely that He existed before any created thing was extant, and that dominion is properly due to Him as the first-born.'

Dr. Fairweather merely denies what seems the obvious meaning of the phrase without further argument.

A few misprints may be noted: Rostootzeff for Rostortzeff (p. 34), Tyropaean for Tyropoean (p. 152), *on* for *as* (p. 250, last line).

Dr. Fairweather's style is so clear that it may seem ungenerous to criticize the vocabulary. *Anon* may be left to the confectioners of historical novels. It is probably too late to protest against the use of *urge* as a noun. *Scribism* is not a pretty word; retiral, declinature, resile, disillusionize, basal, telic, do not seem improvements on their more ordinary equivalents.

The book as a whole is a comprehensive exposition of the author's point of view, which we have indicated, and will stimulate the student, if only to disagreement with the main thesis.

P. R. Smythe.

VOLTAIRE FOR THE MILLION*

The Home University Library was started a quarter of a century ago on the principle of Carlyle's dictum that in these days the true University is a library of books. Its thoroughly catholic character is shown by its list of authors; under the heading of Religion and Philosophy we meet Bishop Gore side by side with Bertrand Russell and Sir Herbert Samuel. Each section of religious thought is presented to us from the standpoint of an adherent; Canon Watson speaks for the Church of England, Professor Selbie for Nonconformity, and the late Professor Bury for free thought. This is as it should be. But we are a little uncertain whether Mr. H. N. Brailsford, who has written the little volume on Voltaire, is a wholehearted Voltairean, or, indeed, whether there are any wholehearted Voltaireans left, except among old-fashioned people in the French Provinces. Voltaire is, we suspect, one of those authors who are more talked about than read; his name has become a symbol, to some of enlightenment, to others of rabid infidelity. Mr. Bodley in his book on France tells us that he once heard a priest in a rural commune exhort his peasant auditors to cast the impious works of Voltaire and Rousseau out of their libraries. Mr. Shaw's Black Girl, after demolishing all the theologies with her knobkerry, finds refuge in a garden which Voltaire cultivates in rather incongruous partnership with an eminent Irish dramatist, comparing notes possibly in the evening on St. Joan and La Pucelle.

Mr. Brailsford's book is a courageous attempt to present a sympathetic portrait of the great humanist of the eighteenth century, and on the whole he succeeds admirably. We are shown Voltaire as the witty poet, enlivening with his sallies the supper tables of the roués of the Regent Orleans. From his exile and voyage of discovery to England he returned to introduce to the French, who had previously known England only as the native country of the Duke of Marlborough, the immortal Newton, Locke, the prince of philosophers, and the incomparable British Constitution. Almost alone of Frenchmen he managed to be popular in England. Some workers, we are told, detecting Voltaire's nationality as he walked the streets, began throwing mud at him. 'Magnanimous islanders,' he apostrophised them, 'is it not misfortune enough for me that I was not born among you?' They cheered him and carried him in triumph to his lodging. In England his temperamental scepticism acquired an intellectual basis.

For the next twenty years Voltaire lived a double life, capturing the Parisian public with his brilliantly frigid tragedies, cultivating the favour of the great; did not Benedict the Fourteenth permit him to dedicate his drama of *Mahomet* to the Vicar of Christ? In his *Life of Charles XII* and his *Siecle de Louis Quatorze* he raises history once more to the dignity of an art. Every literature ought to have its epic, and he gives France a national epic, the *Henriade*, a glorification of the good king, Henry IV, the founder of the House of Bourbon. Unfortunately, he also besmirches the noblest of all French heroines in *La Pucelle*. His contraband works have a curious way of getting published in pirated editions, usually in Holland. We are told once more the story of his prolonged liaison, his unofficial marriage, with the divine Emily, Marquise de Chatelet, a very remarkable woman, a devotee of science and mathematics, who exercised

* *Voltaire*. By H. N. Brailsford. The Home University Library. (Thornton Butterworth, Ltd. 1936. 2/6.)

a strong influence over him. When she died he wrote, 'I have lost the half of myself, a mind for whom mine was made.'

Then comes the turning point in his life, his sojourn in Prussia with the Philosopher King, Frederick the Great, in whom he fondly hoped to find a new Julian. As is well known, his hopes were disappointed, and his quondam friend becomes the object of his most savage pasquinades. Finally, the Patriarch of the Holy Philosophical Church settles down to cultivate his garden at Ferney on the borders of France and Switzerland, and becomes the ideal landlord, the patron of the persecuted and the oppressed, the Nestor of Europe, with whom the Empress of Russia is proud to correspond, and who, when he visits Paris, is welcomed like a crowned head, and expires in a blaze of glory, half-suffocated, so to speak, by roses. It is a wonderful career, that of the universal Monsieur de Voltaire, made possible by the fact that he possessed among his numerous talents an extraordinary gift for money-making, by stockjobbing and the like.

The French Revolution, which transferred the ashes of Voltaire to the Panthéon, produced in the long run a reaction against him and all that he stood for. The privileged classes perceived too late that in patronising the enemy of the Church they had been backing the wrong horse. Voltaire, indeed, had never meant subversive doctrines to spread to the lower orders. On one occasion, when the Baron Holbach was arguing at his table against the existence of a deity, he sent his servants away and said to his guest, 'Continue your argument, my dear Sir; I do not wish to be robbed or murdered.' But, with every precaution, these things do spread to the servants' hall and the peasant's cottage, with unfortunate results to the owners of property and the preservers of game. The French aristocracy, or what was left of it, became and has continued since *dévote*, abhorring Voltaire and all his works. To the revolutionaries, on the other hand, the correspondent of kings and the friend of nobles was suspect; they preferred Rousseau.

When the reaction against the French Revolution had spent its force, the fame of Voltaire re-emerged—a little tarnished. John Morley portrayed the more seemly side of him, but his monograph, as Mr. Brailsford says, is marred by its Victorian Puritanism. Acrid rationalists like Mr. J. M. Robertson, Socialists like Mr. Bernard Shaw and Mr. Brailsford, are among his admirers; one wonders whether Voltaire would have appreciated their admiration. How do we Liberal Churchmen stand with regard to him? One must acknowledge in fairness that nearly all the arguments of what is commonly called the Higher Criticism of the Bible were anticipated by this daring pioneer; without the cumbrous apparatus of German scholarship he riddled the old doctrine of an infallible Bible. Almost every argument to be found in, shall we say, *Colenso on the Pentateuch* is to be found in the *Essais sur les Moeurs,* and how much more readable is the latter work. Voltaire, moreover, was no atheist; he built a church and dedicated it to God; he had a private chapel in his house. When the present writer visited it many years ago he found that its then owner, who seems to have been less pious than Voltaire, had converted it into a stable. 'Voltaire est bigot; il est déiste,' said Holbach. Mr. Brailsford has given an excellent summary of Voltaire's article on Theism in his Philosophic Dictionary.

> 'He says plainly that to consider God simply as a creator who has made admirable machines is not religion. That begins when one realizes that "God has deigned to make a relationship between Himself and men." . . . He is a true Theist who says to God: "I adore

> Thee and serve Thee," and to the Turk, the Chinese and the Russian, "I love you." . . . The Theist is firmly persuaded of the existence of a supreme Being as good as He is powerful, who formed all extended beings, perpetuates their kinds, punishes crimes without cruelty, and recompenses virtuous actions with bounty. The Theist does not know how God punishes, or how He favours or pardons, and is not rash enough to flatter himself that he knows how God acts, but that God acts and that He is just, this he knows. The difficulties that tell against the idea of Providence do not shake his faith, because they are merely difficulties, and not demonstrations. . . . He is submissive to Providence, and . . . believes that it extends to all places and all centuries. . . . To do good is his worship, to submit to God is his doctrine.'

All this sounds very satisfactory and almost conjures up a vision of Voltaire, possibly in gaiters, reading a paper at one of our Conferences. But the vision, somehow, is not quite convincing. Voltaire did not always talk in this strain. 'I do like to hear Matthew Arnold talk—sometimes,' says the spinster aunt in *The New Republic*. Moreover, what matters is not only what a man says, but the way he says it. Voltaire's irreverence is not a mere taste for cynicism or occasional profanity, a taste found in many good and worthy men; it seems sometimes to amount to moral philistinism, a blank want of appreciation of what is fine and noble, discreditable in a man of culture. His treatment of the noblest of heroines, the Maid of Orleans, has outraged French patriotism as well as French piety; Mr. Bernard Shaw, less of a humanist on the whole than Voltaire, has shown himself herein more humane. He has also shown himself a better tactician; he represents Joan as the embodiment of revolt against the Church's authority. It was the tragedy of the eighteenth century that the schism between the humanist and the Christian, implicit no doubt since the Renaissance, became for the first time then open and declared. It has not yet been closed; nay, one sometimes fears it is becoming wider. It must be closed if our civilization is to be saved. If that happy consummation is ever reached, we shall be able to appreciate more fairly than we can at present the great work which Voltaire did for the liberation of the human intellect.

GAMALIEL MILNER.

FROM CHRIST TO CONSTANTINE*

In this volume of almost six hundred pages the Regius Professor-Emeritus of the University of Edinburgh describes the development of the Christian religion from the Sermon on the Mount to the Nicene Creed. The scope of the book is indicated by the six parts into which it is divided.

Part 1 describes the Roman Empire and the turmoil of religious and philosophic influences which were at work within it when Christianity made its appearance.

Part 2, on the founding of the Church, summarises the gospel of the Kingdom of God as taught by Jesus.

> 'Whilst in founding the community He virtually founded the Church, He appears neither to have foreseen nor to have prescribed its developing corporate form. The Church was not born; it developed.'

He then emphasises the importance of the Resurrection appearances which he regards as of a spiritual character. Thus

'Paul's testimony goes back to a time when the belief in the Resurrec-

* *From Christ to Constantine*. By James Mackinnon, Ph.D., D.D., D.Th., Ll.D. (Longmans. 1936. 18/-.)

tion rested on these appearances, as in the case of his own vision, and when that in the empty tomb, along with the circumstantial stories of the resurrection and ascension of the actual body, had not taken shape in the Christian tradition' (p. 63).

Dr. Mackinnon therefore asserts the fact of the resurrection, even though he may discard the story of the empty tomb.

Part 3 describes the beginnings of Gentile Christianity and includes a discriminating though appreciative estimate of St. Paul:

'Into his conception of Christ and His redemptive mission, and His doctrine of justification by faith, he has worked . . . the thought and belief of his Pharisaic experience and training. Into it he has also worked strands from the religion and thought of his Hellenist environment . . . There is therefore a good deal that is problematic in his version of the Gospel of Jesus. On the other hand, there is much in his thought and experience that reflects the mind and heart of Jesus Himself and has perennial value. In his conception of religion as a thing of the spirit, in his reaction from Jewish particularism and legalism, in his insistence on the universality and freedom of the Gospel, in his sublime ethical teaching as the fruit of the Christ-possessed and Spirit-inspired life, he is a true interpreter of the Gospel of Jesus and its implications' (p. 162).

Part 4 is entitled 'The Sub-Apostolic Church,' *i.e.* from A.D. 70 to *c.* 150, and contains, among much else that is interesting, an account of the development of the ministry, both local and universal, with special reference to Ignatius of Antioch.

Part 5 describes 'The Emergence of the Catholic Church,' *c.* 150-300, and is perhaps the most important and characteristic section of the book. Dr. Mackinnon notes the struggle within the Christian society between an emerging 'Catholic Church' and the philosophic speculations of the Gnostics or the Puritanism of the Montanists; the chapter on Montanism contains an account, by no means wholly unfavourable, of Tertullian. While the Church was working out a creed in defence against these forces within, it was periodically persecuted by the Roman Empire. Meanwhile, the official ministry was developing along lines different from those of the earlier periods. The difference between clergy and laity becomes more marked; the episcopate puts out greater claims for its authority over the laity as well as over the presbyters, the most extreme of these advocates of episcopal authority being Cyprian of Carthage.

Part 6, on 'Catholicism and Culture,' contains an appreciative though critical account of the liberal theologians of Alexandria. Of Clement he says (p. 485):

'It is subjective religion, not orthodoxy, that he really represents, though it is subjective religion within strict moral limitations and freed from the vagaries, the moral laxity, the exaggerated asceticism of Gnosticism. Nor can it be said to represent historical Christianity, for the Logos takes the place of the historic Jesus, and the secret teaching of Paul displaces too much that of the doctrine of justification by faith.'

In his chapter on Origen, Dr. Mackinnon pays special attention to Origen's reply to Celsus, and does justice to the heathen critic as well as to the Christian defence. Towards the end of this chapter he says:

> 'The most attractive feature of Origen's view of the Incarnation is that which presents the historic Jesus, not as the realisation of the Logos theory, though this is constantly emphasised, but as the embodiment of the divine purpose and power . . . what Jesus was we may become' (p. 502).

This part ends with a valuable account of the Neo-Platonists.

Part 7 describes the final struggle under Diocletian and his colleagues, the victory of Constantine and the edict of toleration, and then the internal struggle between Arius and Athanasius. The book ends with a judicial estimate of the first Christian Emperor.

This volume is evidently the result of the most painstaking research, and for every statement Dr. Mackinnon gives his authority. One misprint seems to have escaped his notice; on p. 235 Paul of Samosata seems to be referred to the fifth century instead of to the third.

The main thesis of Dr. Mackinnon seems to be that historic Christianity is a syncretist religion starting from the Gospel of the Kingdom of God as announced by Jesus of Nazareth and assimilating during the first three centuries of its course elements from Judaism, from Paul, from Hellenism, and from Roman imperialism. For this reason this volume may be compared with Harnack's *What is Christianity?* though Dr. Mackinnon does not commit himself to Harnack's Liberal Protestant view of Jesus.

The facts collected by Dr. Mackinnon seem to be unassailable. With his inferences there is likely to be considerable disagreement. The book will not please those who resent any other interpretation of the Gospels than that commonly known as 'orthodox'; it will offend those who regard the 'Primitive Church' as a model of a Christian society; it will also displease those who, while radical in their destructive criticism of the Gospel narrative, try to continue the Christian religion on the foundation of a 'Catholic Church.'

Yet, though his standpoint may be regarded as 'unorthodox,' he has, in this as in his first volume, *The Historic Jesus,* a sincere respect for and devotion to the Founder of Christianity. Though he is not 'ecclesiastically minded' and is critical of such ecclesiastics as Cyprian or Athanasius, he does not vilify or despise the church of the first three centuries; thus in his preface he says:

> 'The expansion of the Christian mission in conflict with this formidable antagonism (of imperial Rome) is one of the most heroic and impressive things in ancient history' (p. viii).

And while his criticisms may be unwelcome to many readers, they are always stated with moderation and without the dogmatic bitterness that can mar the work of the anti-ecclesiastical critic as fatally as that of the 'clerically minded.'

In the preface (which should be studied by every careful reader of the book) Dr. Mackinnon states that the book embodies many courses of lectures delivered at Edinburgh University to students both in the Arts and in the Divinity Faculties. Those who try to teach 'Church History' with far slenderer qualifications will probably envy those students (theological or otherwise) who were introduced to that subject by a professor combining a sincere appreciation of Christianity with vast knowledge of the evidence plus the judicial faculty which is the mark of the historian.

J. F. Clayton.

WHAT LIVING RELIGIONS HAVE IN COMMON*

Those who have made use of Professor R. E. Hume's *The World's Living Religions,* in our view much the best practical guide to the study of this immense subject, will welcome another popular and practical volume from the author on the same theme but constructed from a different point of view.

Prof. Hume's latest volume, *Treasure House of the Living Religions,* brings home to those who will use it how much the great religions of the world have in common on their highest side. The student of Sir James Frazer's many volumes has learned to recognize how ancient and how widespread religious customs are. What an extraordinary survival power these customs possess, so that even the higher religions retain a number of them although these customs are the reflection of religious ideas — credulities and taboos—which those higher religions have transcended. We have a familiar example of this in the reverence paid to sacred trees by Mohammedans, whose religion, theoretically, has left far behind the ancient tree worship which preceded the rise of Islam in the East. What Prof. Hume's latest volume deals with, if not of greater interest, is obviously of much more practical value.

To-day we recognize that religion is one in its origin : we recognize also that all religion is subject to different degrees of evolution : we recognize furthermore that whilst a number of these past stages of religious evolution had the greatest value for mankind in past periods of his history, they have no value whatsoever to-day. Indeed, the statement can be put in a stronger form—these primitive types of religious faith and practice, if they survive into the modern world, become the enemies, not the servants, of moral and spiritual evolution. It is only in the highest form of the highest living religions among mankind that anything of practical religious value can be found for instruction and inspiration to-day. It is from these sources that Prof. Hume has drawn for the contents of his *Treasure House of the Living Religions.* The author writes in his Preface :

> 'This book aims to present the quintessence of the religious wisdom of the world since the tenth century before Christ. All the historic faiths now living have been drawn upon to contribute of their treasures ; and it is intended that these pages shall contribute to an increase of positive knowledge and also to a general increase of faith, hope and love of mankind.
>
> 'All the religions of the world teach that man can, and should, be come perfected through the various processes of salvation. The fullest fruit of religious life comes, partly in attaining the proper relation of man with the Supreme, and partly also in proper sympathy between man and man. Such convictions have provided the plan for exhibiting the common elements among the enduring organized religions ; and a methodical scheme has been followed for collecting and for arranging the materials in this book.'

Dr. Hume makes his selections from the sacred scriptures of eleven religions, namely, Hinduism, Judaism, Shinto, Zoroastrianism, Taoism, Jainism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Christianity, Islam and Sikhism. He notes that all these living religions of to-day originated in Asia : four in

* *Treasure House of the Living Religions.* By R. E. Hume, M.A., Ph.D. (Scribners. 1933. 12/6.)

the South, three in the East, four in the West. And only two of them, Islam and Sikhism, have come into existence since Christianity was born.

Shinto, the national religion of Japan, is the most primitive of these eleven religions since it is animistic. Its classic scriptures being neither suitable nor profitable for modern religious citation has led Dr. Hume in this case alone to cite its post-canonical productions.

Dr. Hume points out that the scriptures of these religions contain a great body of higher truth upon which all the more enlightened adherents of these religions are agreed. Yet this body of higher religious truth was produced for the most part in isolated areas, and so originated independently. This consensus possesses an evidential value for the truth of those affirmations in which all these religions are agreed. This volume does not deal with the disagreements between the higher religions, a matter of no little interest, nor with the personalities of their founders, for all of them had personal founders with the exception of Hinduism and Shinto.

Dr. Hume has many interesting things to say about the sacred scriptures of these religions. All those religions owe an incalculable debt to their Scriptures, upon the study of which they have depended for their survival. In handling their Scriptures they have exhibited a double capacity. First, the power to maintain the essentials of their religious tradition, or the power of continuity; and, secondly, the ability to adapt their traditional faith to modern needs and conditions. It is of importance to note this double relation between the higher living religions and their sacred scriptures — and it should be stressed that it is only the higher forms of religions that possess sacred scriptures at all — because certain advanced Christians to-day are asking: What shall we do with our Bible? Does it not present more difficulty than value for Christian faith? Should we not depend upon the guidance of the Divine Spirit alone and dispense with our Scriptures? The answer plainly is: Retain your Scriptures, but interpret them, not in the light of ancient tradition, but in accordance with the teaching of the Divine Spirit. Interpret them so as to secure essential continuity and living progress. In the number of the translations of its sacred Scriptures, Christianity far surpasses all other religions. The translations of the Christian Scriptures number 927. This, like the vast body of its adherents, is due to the vigorous character of Christian propaganda.

Much care and immense erudition have been shown in the construction of this volume. Dr. Hume is himself a great scholar, as the publication by the Clarendon Press of his translation of *The Thirteen Principal Upanishads* attests. The vast number of citations in the *Treasure House of the Living Religions* are most carefully documented and translated. As the author affirms:

> 'The book . . . can serve as a scientific work of wide range and of rigorous exactitude, as well as a volume both representing and fostering the religious life of mankind.'

An entirely original feature of this volume is furnished by Part IV: a programme of joint worship which consists of a series of citations from the various sacred scriptures woven together into a liturgical service. Perhaps the best way at the present time for securing religious unity among mankind would be by promoting the common worship of God and the common practice of virtue rather than by attempting to secure common agreement on a number of conflicting religious beliefs. Such was the idea of Sir Francis Younghusband, as exemplified by his recent religious conference in London among the adherents of the different religious faiths.

H.D.A.M

FIVE CENTURIES OF RELIGION*

The publication of *Five Centuries of Religion* has been one of the outstanding historical undertakings of the Cambridge Press in this generation, and in the third volume that is now ready we have what many will regard as the most striking and substantial instalment yet. The sub-title, 'Getting and Spending,' indicates the main theme of the contents—the way in which the medieval religious acquired their wealth and the manner in which they disposed of it. Throughout the book the emphasis is upon the normal and usual, upon the everyday life of the average monk who 'was just what we call in our own day an ordinary decent fellow.' With one exception, that of Suger, there is no outstanding character-sketch like those of St. Benedict and St. Bernard which gained so much deserved praise for the first volume, and there is no catena of generalizations such as caused some head-shakings over the second volume.

Dr. Coulton has here succeeded in making the vital subject of monastic finance intelligible and interesting. There is the learning of a life-time behind the rich and mellow prose that describes how the 'aristocrats of the cloister' came to occupy the privileged position of solid comfort and security that was usually theirs. No attempt is made to disguise the fact that the pious gifts of early generations were supplemented by many good business transactions and by some dubious examples of pious fraud and thinly disguised embezzlement. And yet, even so, the burden of debts unnecessarily incurred often became overpowering. In this, as in so much else, with the abbot the ultimate responsibility usually lay, and there was little guarantee that the abbot would be worthy of his office.

During the years with which this volume is mainly concerned the monk was almost invariably also a priest; the masses he said were held in high esteem, so much so that endowments frequently came conditionally upon mass-celebration, with resultant commercialization and, ultimately, neglect of earlier obligations. The skilful exploitation of popular reverence for relics and the difficulties often involved by 'invention,' 'translation' and duplication of these are explained (or would it be better to say exposed?), and the money-value of the monastic habit and of interment in the cloister is made clear.

In the later Middle Ages a substantial part of the monastic income was derived from the appropriation of parish churches and the staffing of these with poorly paid vicars. The section dealing with this, and with the evil results in many parishes, where the poor were often the chief sufferers, is full of interesting and recondite information. Of the *commendam* system there is no clearer account in English than that given on pages 428-447; of the economic mismanagement of many great houses leading to heavy indebtedness and reduction of numbers no better illustrative facts are likely to be found, while the harm to the monastic ideal involved in the practical abandonment of the vow of poverty is skilfully interwoven as a kind of background to the whole.

As an analysis of the 'ways and means' of monasticism, and as an exposition of the effects of corporate property-owning upon medieval religion, Dr. Coulton's volume is of the highest value, while into bibliography, footnotes and nearly one hundred appendices are packed full and adequate vouchers for every important statement, incidentally providing hints for further work in the same field. When we have so much it is ungrateful to ask for more, but in a volume on 'Getting and Spending' monastic build-

* *Five Centuries of Religion.* Vol. III. (Cambridge University Press. 1936. 35/-.)

ing, for example, seems to deserve more space than it receives, space which might have been obtained by careful squeezing and by the avoidance of certain repetitions in the text. The book is no final and completed account; there are two further volumes of 'pioneer work' yet to come, but already enough has appeared not only for Dr. Coulton to be hailed as the greatest living master of his theme, but also for it to be clear that this is the central volume of his great work and worthy in every way of that position.

G. R. Potter.

HAS THE WORLD A MEANING?*

The Dean of St. Paul's likens the teleological argument for the existence of God to the third strand of a rope, the other strands being the ontological and the cosmological arguments. Each lends strength to the others; but the teleological strand is subordinate to the other two strands. Behind the three arguments, he holds, lie a religious experience and a religious tradition, and he values the arguments as confirmatory of experience and tradition rather than as exploratory of reality. The cosmological argument, which aims at establishing the existence of a First Cause or ground of phenomena, provides a rational foundation for affirmations about the nature of God, inasmuch as the Being of God cannot be lower than the Universe of which He is the continuing Cause. It thus goes further than the ontological argument, which, basing its demonstration of the existence of God on the presence of the idea of God in the human mind, can say nothing about the nature of the God Whose existence it attempts to prove. The teleological argument takes into account the events of time and space, and seeks for verification of the results of the other two arguments in the world of our actual experience.

Not every theologian or philosopher would agree with Dr. Matthews in ascribing such weight to the cosmological and ontological arguments. Since the time of Kant they have been, according to one distinguished philosopher, permanent invalids, and, he adds, it must be admitted that they have now received their *quietus*. Dr. Tennant remarks that though the ontological argument seems self-evidently cogent to a philosopher here and there, its fallaciousness is self-evident to all the rest. The ontological argument, according to Prof. Field, never convinced anyone except St. Anselm.

Behind these classical arguments for Theism there lie, according to Dr. Matthews, tradition and experience. That we start with traditional beliefs no one would deny; but there are various traditions, and there is no *a priori* reason to hold that the tradition to which we happen to be born is the true one. The power of tradition is a sociological fact which has no necessary philosophical significance. It seems to be declining, and, as far as one can judge, will continue to decline. The value of 'religious experience' as a basis for theistic belief has been strongly challenged by convinced theists. The existence of Buddhist 'religious experience,' for instance, may not be questioned; but it does not point to anything which we may describe as theism.

The theist who doubts the validity of the ontological and cosmological arguments, and seeks a firmer basis for his belief than that provided by tradition or by an ambiguous and polymorphous 'religious experience,' will welcome the cogency with which Dr. Matthews expounds the teleological argument, and will probably attach more weight to it than does Dr. Matthews himself.

* *The Purpose of God.* By W. R. Matthews. (Nisbet and Co., Ltd. 1935. 7/6 net.)

Dr. Matthews thus summarizes the facts from which it starts:

> 'There is, first, the impression of an order which is both rational and sublime; there is, secondly, the fact that the universe, when interrogated by reason, seems to be a coherent system; there is, thirdly, the fact that this system is in motion and that it brings to birth values, higher types of existence, in the course of its change; and there is, fourthly, the consideration that the search for explanation and understanding of existence can never reach a conclusion which will satisfy us unless we can conceive it as a teleological order, for only by such insight can we obtain any answer to the question, Why?'

He disposes of the theory that a world so ordered could be the result of chance. Such a theory involves self-contradictory presuppositions and is inconsistent with the results of modern science. The conception of the purposeless evolution of an ordered universe out of chaos is unintelligible, for 'any evolution presupposes some order within which and by reason of which it happens.' The theory of 'emergent evolution' is merely descriptive and explains nothing. 'A true philosophy of evolution should be able to tell us not only that higher types of being emerge but why they emerge. You get no further by endowing the original stuff of Space-Time with a 'nisus.'

> 'Obviously, if you like to endow your primordial stuff, Space-Time, or matter, or whatever you choose, with unlimited potentialities, by the aid of some ingenuity you can deduce the whole "choir of heaven and furniture of earth" from it; but you still have to explain how the "stuff" could possess these potentialities, and until you do so your philosophy remains descriptive and is not explanatory. In the beginning was Space-Time; in the beginning was the Thought; whichever of these two propositions we prefer to believe, no one could deny that the second was more intelligible.'

Any consideration of the universe which leaves man out of account has omitted the most significant element.

> 'Man, who knows and values and appreciates, is no alien in the universe. He is the revelation of its nature. In him the universe discloses itself in its real inner being—not as dead system, but as living Spirit.'

Natural selection as a final explanation breaks down before the phenomenon of the thirst for righteousness and truth.

> 'Jeremiah in Jerusalem and Hegel writing philosophy during the Battle of Jena were perhaps the greatest men of two times of conflict. Neither can be said to have contributed to the survival of the groups of which they were members.'

The presentation of the teleological argument is followed by a chapter in which Dr. Matthews discusses some of the problems involved in the conception of a teleological universe. There 'is an appearance at least of sheer contingency in history which forbids us to regard it as throughout a teleologically ordered process.' Nevertheless in spite of the presence of chance, Dr. Matthews gives reason for concluding that history does exhibit a teleological character:

> 'The history of man is not completed. We are reading a story of which we know only a part, and that very imperfectly. We have no certain information of how much remains to be told. That it should have an enigmatic appearance is not surprising, for we are like a man

who should find in a railway carriage a detective story which has been torn in two. He has the first part, which states the problem and elaborates the *imbroglio*, but the second part, which could contain the solution and the *dénouement*, is missing. But we are not left without material for intelligent conjecture. The historical task and destiny of mankind is not finished, but we can see the outline of the purpose which guides the process.'

In a concluding chapter on the Purpose of God, Dr. Matthews deals with the theological implications of the teleological interpretation of the world. The doctrine of the self-sufficiency of God must, he says, be abandoned.

'If then God wills and has purpose, in any sense which is really analogous to our experience of voluntary action with a view to an end, we must suppose that the ideal content of His purpose is held over against some discrepant, or at least potentially discrepant, actuality.'

Dr. Matthews does not deal at any length in explicit fashion with the problem of evil and 'dysteleology,' but he says that it is his ambition to devote a separate work to this subject. If the cynic be right in describing gratitude as a lively expectation of favours to come, the readers of *The Purpose of God* will be deeply grateful. Some of them may find the first two chapters rather heavy going. If so, they will be wise to read and re-read them until they have mastered their somewhat compressed argument. If they are not prepared to do this, it is to be hoped that their initial difficulty will not deter them from reading the rest of the book. On all sides the question Why? is being asked with increasing insistence, and it is essential that the parish priest should be competent to provide the enquirer with an adequate answer. In his book Dr. Matthews gives him valuable help in this direction. His argument is skilfully displayed and lucidly expressed, and is well seasoned with the salt of wit. G. L. H. HARVEY.

A VOCATIONAL APPROACH TO THEOLOGY*

Professor Calhoun is a young and brilliant professor in the Yale Divinity School, and his latest book is an interesting development in the growth of Religious Realism. As a student of the history of philosophy and religion, Calhoun brings to his analysis of the present situation the perspective and balance of a wealth of tradition. His knowledge of Platonism and Thomism, in particular, stands him in good stead.

Calhoun begins his book by analyzing the various doctrines of vocation as part of the Christian religion.

'We need, as our ancestors needed, to be possessed by a positive concrete conviction—a form filled with engrossing, inexhaustible content—if we are to recover that real and effective sense of day-to-day urgency, opportunity, and obligation for want of which the thinner sorts of Christianity have come to compare so badly with what we have been told of working Communism at its best' (p. 17).

'A vocation must be regarded first of all as a systematic and persistent doing of needful work. . . . (It) may be regarded further as an absorbing, inclusive, and purposeful putting forth and development of an individual's own constituent powers. . . . A vocation should be a willing contributive share in the world's work and common life' (pp. 54, 56, 59).

* *God and the Common Life.* By Robert Lowry Calhoun. Taylor Lectures, Yale University. (Scribner. 1934. $2.50.)

But if work ought to be such as this, it is obvious that it is not; and it cannot be until we have at least a working theology and a working theory of the nature of society which will provide the prerequisites for such work. In times past, when society was organized on relatively simple lines, such a theory of work could be actually realized; but to-day we are faced with a complex society and an uncertain theology.

We must turn to 'religious realism' for our answer. For it

> 'undertakes to criticize and endeavours to change the actual, in the conviction that it ought to be and, in principle, can become better than at any specifiable time it is' (p. 75).

The religious realist is primarily what William James described as 'tough-minded.' He deals with the history of real events and persons, believing that

> 'both facts and forms, whatever be the status or mode of being assigned to either, transcend in their range to an unknown extent the range of actual human observation and thought.'

He realizes, furthermore, that the line of good and evil cuts through all things. 'The actual is ambivalent.' In the very temperament of religious realism is an impatience with what seems evil, and a tendency to take sides in actual struggles, favouring the better no matter how far short of the ideal it falls. But through all this, there is a healthy scepticism which refuses to accept anything as final.

There is further analysis of the nature of man, who is biologically no more than an animal, but who at the same time has other qualities. 'A quadruped really has no use for satire' (p. 97). One of the fundamental elements in the growth to true manhood is through self-devotion to work. Human work should be that which lends itself to greater mutuality between men. It makes no great difference whether the work be 'high' or 'low.' The human mind, if it be healthy, has two essential factors:

> 'learning and sagacity. By learning it is meant that one has come to react to present details, even to meagre hints, with a complexity of response acquired through numerous past experiences. By sagacity it is meant that one's attention is laid open so widely to the present situation that each of many significant cues in it, however obscure, may have a chance to act as a present efficient stimulus, and that the several significant cues may act with duly proportioned effectiveness' (p. 122).

In healthy work, mind plays an important part. In theological language we may say that mind

> 'is both immanent and transcendent as regards the actual present situation. It is immanent in so far as it enters into direct causal and stimulus-response relations with what is actually here now. It is transcendent of the immediate situation in so far as, by way of symbolic behaviour, it takes into account also what is not actually here now' (p. 126).

It is impossible adequately to cover the wealth of material in this book. Briefly, we may state what we believe is the theology of the author, a theology which will be an adequate springboard for his doctrine of man and theory of vocation. Borrowing and adapting Thomas Aquinas' theory of sufficient reason and then proceeding from the fundamental processes by analogy, Professor Calhoun develops his doctrine of God. But before reaching this, we have an excellent interpretation of modern scientific theories, with especial attention to the results of physics, biology, psy-

chology, and sociology. We thus come to man as the product of emergent evolution, an animal who at the same time is critic, creator, and worshipper. What then is his position in the universe? In the history of man we see certain events which may be considered 'special revelations,' and one of these is the life and death of Jesus; but even here we must be willing to use that sagacity of mind by which we will endeavour 'to see the life and death of Jesus and the ups and downs of Christianity' in comparison with the lives of non-Christians; and thus we may see more clearly the meaning of the special revelation.

By a process of analogy (although recognizing its weaknesses) we reach the concept of God. We can only present the conclusions: God is not dependent on or limited to the space-time span. As Divine Mind, He is Creator, Redeemer, Leader. He is neither all-inclusive nor all-powerful, but He is limited by the very perfection (in the Greek sense) of His own goodness, by the waywardness of the world, and by the very 'rigidities' of the world structure. God is both transcendent and related to men by 'communicative immanence.'

The final chapter deals with the possibilities of co-operation with God through worship and work. There is the problem of finding and doing one's job, fraught with difficulties both within the individual and in society. There is the question of radical social reconstruction; and the writer analyses many possibilities.

> 'Basic methods of reconstruction must go directly to such basic problems as population control, both quantitative and qualitative; conservation, utilization, and enhancement of natural physical resources; and development of more adequate provision for public health (physical and mental) and for public education, including adult education. . . . These methods too must be specific, not panacean' (p. 230).

We must try negotiation, political campaigns, direct coercion through strikes and boycotts when really necessary, and even non-violent coercion of the extreme type (when carefully applied in a specific case). We must, in other words, steer a middle course between violence and non-violence, with faith in the teachability of man. And this presupposes faith in God.

> 'We have said we believe in God as Mind, Spirit, Holy Will at work within and beyond our half-made actual world; a Creator-Redeemer God bringing order out of chaos. Not mere chaos and not perfect order; but concrete stuff (matter, energy, flux, whatever it be) in process of being shaped into more complex and meaningful parts and wholes. God, as we have said, is transcendent beyond the actual world of any specified epoch, even while operating within it as effective organizing power; effecting change in the current world-situation, while extending beyond it in time-span, in cognitive range, and in mode of being.
>
> 'Men are not parts of God, nor one with God, nor gods in their own right. They are creatures, in the sense that for their existence they are utterly dependent upon powers beyond themselves; and in the further sense that their goodness and their powers to achieve good are likewise derived, and when compared with even such good men as men themselves can clearly envisage, and far more when compared with what one may dimly suppose God to be, must seem humiliatingly small. Yet men, for Christian faith, are likewise such that they may become "sons of God" and "co-labourers with God." . . . Herein is the ultimate ground and meaning of each man's vocation: not that he is

> an isolated object of divine solicitude, prompting and salvage, but that he is called to be a contributing participant in a shared task and a common life. . . . The call is not coercive. . . . But the initiative is first and forever from God's side' (pp. 241-242).

Here is the rich and noble faith of a young scholar, a man steeped in Christianity and Platonism, embodying the rich heritage of the race and applying it to the present situation in a novel and important manner. We may at times object to his 'logic by analogy' as not being entirely true to his 'critical realism'; but we cannot doubt the faith that prompts his analogy. The book is well-informed, well-written, and closely thought-out. It is not a book for spare time reading, but for careful and thorough analysis.

RANDOLPH C. MILLER.

RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE*

I have found it extraordinarily difficult to get to grips with the argument of this book, although it is written for the enlightenment of the ordinary educated reader. I am not quite sure even after two careful readings what it is that the author is trying to say. The Introduction sets out the questions to be answered. They are 'What is religious experience?' and 'How far is it valid, if at all?' The last chapter thus summarizes the answer:

> 'I have contended that religious experience is, rightly understood, theistic, and that it rests upon three main supports — the empirical, the ontal, and the axiological.'

I cannot see how religious experience can rest upon the support of religious experience (the empirical argument), nor how it can, if the author is right in contending that it is immediate, rest upon the support of arguments which are evolved from it. And this uncertainty and perplexity is typical of what I have found all through the book.

When it is said that religious experience is valid, I want to ask, first, Whose experience? and, second, Valid for what? The experience of the Astronomer Royal when he looks at the stars is very different from mine, and mine is very different from that of a savage. The experience of a savage may be valid to the extent of showing that there is 'something' there, but for very little else. Similarly, it seems to me that there is little meaning in speaking of the validity of religious experience in the abstract, as though it were a faculty possessed by all men and uninfluenced by knowledge, tradition, and in fact the whole of a man's mental make-up. It is, as it seems to me, the author's failure to admit this wholeheartedly that makes his book confusing and difficult.

We are told (p. 15) that 'It is an immediate knowledge of God which is characteristic of religious experience.' We ask to whose experience the author appeals, and he properly replies, in the first place, 'To my own.' In this experience he distinguishes three elements. (1) Awareness of a Personal Being as one who knows, loves and controls this little human life. (2) A specific emotion of awe and reverence. (3) An element of desire and yearning. But later in the book the experience of other men is adduced—of H. G. Wells, of Julian Huxley, or Middleton Murry. *Their* experience does not seem to them to contain these elements at all. What, then, becomes of the argument from experience? Strangely enough the author's

* *Man and God:* An Essay in the Psychology and Philosophy of Religious Experience. By Lindsay Dewar. (S.P.C.K. 1935. 7/6.)

answer is that they are at fault in the interpretation they put upon their experience.

> 'All religious experience, like every other kind, must be sifted, criticized, and adjusted to the body of human knowledge.'

This is, of course, our position. But we should add that the result of that sifting and adjustment will be that the experience itself will change its quality, and that the admission is fatal to the claim that through religious experience we have immediate knowledge of God; if, at least, the concept of God is clothed with any positive qualities whatsoever.

But perhaps, after all, this is not the author's meaning. He may mean that the so-called proofs of the existence of God are logically sound, and would not make a man religious even if they did succeed in convincing him; that, in short, they are only the rectification and purification of a religious tendency in man which existed before modern theology, and in the absence of which all rational argument about God would be futile. If that is his position, he does not make it clear, and he does not defend it well. It is indeed almost obviously true. The defence of religion against the man who complains that he cannot see God through his telescope has often been undertaken before with more cogency and much more charm and persuasiveness than it is here; for example, in Illingworth's Bampton Lectures.

I think the book suffers from having been put together from lectures. The chapters do not hang together very well. There is a good chapter on the psychological attack on religion. But what is one to make of the following passage about aesthetic experience?

> 'The other significant fact (which is commonly overlooked) is the frequency with which the language of *magic* is used in connection with the aesthetic experience of nature. We speak of being "spell bound" by a beautiful scene; we behold it "rapt" or "enchanted." These and other similar terms, however, being derived from magic, presuppose the existence of a magician. I suggest that the employment of such terminology by ordinary men and women, as well as by poets, bears unconscious but important witness to the fact that the aesthetic experience, as such, is not pantheistic.'

R. J. Stanford.

THE GOSPEL OF COURAGE*

The keynote of Dr. Fosdick's latest book, as the title itself suggests, is courage. He in America, as Dr. Sheppard in England, is essentially the protagonist of practical Christianity. He finds quite naturally that happy medium lying between theology for the specialist and religion for the average man, and while in no way cheapening belief in order to make it credible to the uninitiated, has a rare gift of presenting Christianity in not only an acceptable but an attractive form. Clearly, the man who can talk of the problems of everyday life in an everyday manner will always have a wider public than the scholarly theologian, who may have no gift of conveying his knowledge in order to help others to live. The living of life is the acid test, and this Dr. Fosdick realises fully. He believes in life, and does not hesitate to proclaim it as a glorious adventure for the man

* *The Power to See it Through.* Twenty-five Sermons on Christianity To-day. By Harry Emerson Fosdick. (Student Christian Movement Press. 1935. 6/-.)

who has the courage of faith. There is more than an echo of Browning's indomitable philosophy in the words :

> ' whatever else life may give or may deny, one thing is absolutely indispensable—that a man should not break faith with himself . . . that whatever else may fail, he should not inwardly be a failure ' (pp. 11, 12).

Throughout the book he stresses the value of inner victory : the triumph over self which is the only triumph that is finally worth while.

In the sermon ' Christians in spite of everything,' he speaks of the various adverse conditions over which men of character have prevailed :

> ' a spiritual victory won in the face of hostile environment—that is what being a Christian is all about ' (p. 24).

By the transforming power of faith it is possible to turn bitterest experience into highest good. The crucifixion of deep sorrow, irretrievable loss, may, by God's grace, change to the glorious new life of Easter Day. There is no circumstance, no handicap of environment, no loss or tragedy, which the courageous Christian cannot turn to good. The power of the Spirit of God within, the strong acceptance of God's Will (which demands far more strength than rebellion), the certainty that in spite of temporary evidence to the contrary eventually ' all things work together for good to them that love God,' these are the foundations of the Christian life, the impregnable fortress from which the Christian goes forth to meet all life's reverses. There is no other way to victory.

Again and again Dr. Fosdick dwells on the power gained from belief in God and acceptance of the Christian life :

> ' a vital faith in God gives a man available resources of interior power ' (p. 19), ' all profound religion has made to life these three major contributions : a great philosophy, a great ethic, a great resource of power ' (p. 167).

In the sermon on ' The High Uses of Serenity ' he speaks of the sense in which the Christian faith always and inevitably transcends a merely humanistic ethic. It is simply not possible to build up a sound philosophy, and with it a secure system of morals, which excludes God ; the foundations of such beliefs are built on shifting sand, and ' when trouble comes there is no high philosophy of life or deep resources of power to give serenity ' (p. 167). Here he pleads for ' the religion that helps a man to live from a great depth of being ' (p. 167), the kind of religion that he earlier defines as the supreme mark of a powerful character. There must be this depth of being ; there must also be an inner serenity, ' the basis of powerful activity,' in all greatness : in art, as in individual lives.

The Christianity Dr. Fosdick proclaims is the Christianity of a true fighter : like Dr. Sheppard, he, a great pacifist, wages incessant war ; like Browning also, who declared that ' when the fight begins within himself, a man's worth something.' Such men understand that spiritual warfare exceeds in depth, intensity and torment any material battle, and that this is the warfare pre-eminently worth waging. Of actual war Dr. Fosdick speaks with enviable calm and power. On page after page he gives, simply and unemotionally, facts and statistics proving the folly, sin and economic disaster war entails. It is illuminating to read, and useful to remember, that

> ' in the last war not more than five per cent. of the sixty-six million

soldiers of all nations were volunteers, ninety-five per cent. of them were conscripts' (p. 155).

William Wilberforce sometimes despaired of bringing about an end to the slave traffic; statesmen spoke of it as inevitable, as to-day many speak of war, but William Wilberforce was possessed by an idea that would not let him rest, the idea that at last

'spread like fire from mind to mind; that slavery was wrong, that it could never be harmonised with the principles of Christ, that it was, as well, economically self-defeating' (p. 222),

and slavery was at last abolished. So with the idea of war; there are many who still think of it as inevitable, but there are many more who look upon it as humanity's worst crime, and who make no attempt to reconcile it with their consciences, knowing that at last the law of Christ must prevail, and that destruction of human life in an attempt to settle international disputes will eventually be regarded with the horror with which we now look upon slavery. Dr. Fosdick remains calm; he knows it is best so to confront his opponents. He realizes that

'we will never get rid of war unless we stop being sentimental about it. War is supported among the great masses of the population mainly by sentimentality — martial music, gay uniforms, massing of the colours, the romanticising of what goes on in war, and above all else, by emotional appeals to patriotism, as though patriotism and war were synonymous' (p. 101).

Dr. Fosdick has inevitably much to say of spiritual liberty: the 'service that is perfect freedom.' It is necessary for a man to be 'possessed' by something greater than himself in order to be free. This is the kind of paradox in which religion abounds; it is akin to Jesus's saying: 'he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it,' akin to St. Paul's meaning in the words 'as having nothing, and yet possessing all things.' There is no truth without paradox, and of paradox there can be no explanation. But surrender to the personality of Christ, submission to the Will of God, clarifies all the obscurity of paradox; truth is no longer 'seen through a glass darkly, but face to face,' and surrender is at once freedom.

No one reading Dr. Fosdick's sermon on 'What is our religion doing to our characters?' should have any further doubts as to the positive joy of the Christian life, despite its difficulties.

'Joy is not a weak thing; it is the visible sign and ultimate evidence of inward spiritual triumph' (p. 228).

Religion, 'as any genuine experience in a high realm of spiritual life,' should bring joy, radiance, even gaiety. Yet for so long it has been associated in many minds with prohibitions and gloom. Too often the Church is sought, and religion only thought of, at times of extreme human happiness and disaster—marriage and death—and then merely as a necessity. But to the Christian of Dr. Fosdick's calibre, faith is the mainspring of life, the only possible background, giving courage, serenity, and the only joy worthy of the name. This is the secret of the calm power and inner radiance which is everywhere recognised as Christian, but too rarely understood.

'. . . such men
Carry the fire, all things grow warm to them.'

DALLAS KENMARE.

THE STORY OF AN OLD MEETING HOUSE*

This little book is the history of the Westgate Chapel, Lewis, which began by the refusal of two Incumbents of that Town, with many of their parishioners, to accept the Act of Uniformity in 1662. It relates the fortunes of this little community during three centuries. The early days of persecution—for the Act of Uniformity was followed by the two Conventicle and the Five Mile Acts—were borne with true Christian fortitude. With the days of toleration came the welding together of two distinct traditions, the Presbyterian and the Independent, and later, the gradual development of doctrine from Calvinism to Unitarianism.

This development was possible without disruption because the bond of union in the congregation was not a creed, but a covenant. The words of this covenant, an old Puritan one, are worth quoting :

> 'We covenant with God and one another to walk in all His ways made known or to be made known unto us according to our best endeavours.'

The book is well written, and the author never strays from his subject. He tells us nothing of the events which lead up to the Act of Uniformity, but confines himself to the story of the old Meeting House, and its ministers. Yet the interest is by no means local. The story is a very interesting and edifying side-light on history and well worth reading by a much larger public than those personally acquainted with the Westgate Chapel.

There are some excellent illustrations by Edmund H. New.

J. McDONALD.

* *The Story of An Old Meeting House.* By J. M. Connell. Illustrated by E. H. New. Second edition. (Longman, Green & Co., Ltd. 1936. 2/6.)

CORRESPONDENCE

ALEXANDER NAIRNE.

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

SIR,

The news of the death of the Rev. Dr. Alexander Nairne (Canon of Windsor) on Sunday, March 15th, was a great shock to his friends and has left the theological world poorer. It has been said that Dr. Nairne took no interest in modern theories of religion or in the ordinary affairs of life, but I would hesitate to endorse those statements. No one who knew him would trouble about defining his churchmanship, and if to the casual observer he seemed to move apart from the ways of the world, to those who were privileged to gain a deeper insight into his personality he might be regarded as an ethereal spirit on whom the sordid or garish side of life could make no impression. Though his eyes were ever on the blue distances, he searched the wide vistas that lay between to find a point where nature and God were one.

Of his home life I cannot speak, but as a pupil of his I can speak with first-hand knowledge, and in this way, perhaps, I came to know him more personally than many of my fellow-students, for I corresponded with him for many years after I left college and he helped me greatly in the recommendation of books for my own reading and the preparation of lectures. I owe to him, I think, more than to any of my tutors whatever I gained of

inspiration in my theological work, and the notes of his lectures which I still have in my possession were the basis of my teaching when I obtained a lectureship myself and had the privilege of handing on to others something of the delight which I had received.

I think many of my contemporaries would agree with me, for he made a great appeal to women students. One of my friends once remarked: 'The worst of Professor Nairne is he is so interesting one cannot take notes.' On the other hand, one might say that was the best of him; it was his personality that gripped, and those followed him best who watched his expression; in fact it was impossible to do otherwise.

As a writer, perhaps he is not widely known, but all his books bear the stamp of the scholar. To those who possess something of the mystic sense they should make appeal, but to the more practical-minded they will probably be characterised as vague. *Everyman's Story of the Old Testament* and the companion volume of the New Testament could, however, hardly fail to meet with general appreciation. His other works known well to students are *The Epistle of Priesthood, The Faith of the Old Testament, The Faith of the New Testament, Johannine Writings, The Life Eternal, here and now,* and his most recent work on the *Book of Job*. With regard to this latter, it has already been well reviewed, and it would be difficult to find anyone more able to write on this book. He was saturated with the spirit of it.

E. M. HIGHFIELD.

92 Ash Road, Sutton, Surrey.
April 7th, 1936.

SOVIET COMMUNISM: A NEW CIVILIZATION?

SIR,

There has been much space lately given in the *Modern Churchman* to Socialism and Communism; but I have not noticed any complete reference to, or interest in, the great work of those mighty and painstaking investigators, Sidney and Beatrice Webb (*Soviet Communism: A New Civilization?* 2 vols., 1,200 pages, published by Longmans, Green & Co.).

It is too big a book for the ordinary man to read, but its contents should be known by all students who want to arrive at the truth. It is easy to condemn the Bolshevik *régime* and to hold it up as a warning against the spread of Communism in England, especially in the anti-God campaign to frighten good Christians, of what may follow here. The writers explain that

> 'it is not easy to appreciate either the magnitude of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (nearly one-sixth of the entire land surface of the globe, with a population approaching two hundred millions); or the variety ranging from barbarism to a high degree of culture of its hundred or more different races and languages. Its organizational structure is surely the most complicated known to political science.'

In answer to the question, Will Bolshevism spread? we get the concluding reply:

> 'Will this new civilization, with its abandonment of planned production for community consumption, and the consequent liquidation of the landlord and the capitalist, spread to other countries? Our own reply is: Yes, it will. But how, when, where, with what modification, and whether through violent revolution or by peaceful penetration, or even by conscious imitation, are questions we cannot answer.'

As to the two most-feared aspects of Bolshevism, *viz.* anti-Godism and the loss of freedom, the writers thus comment (p. 1004) on the former:

'As to the violent denunciation and energetic uprooting, from one end of the Soviet Union to the other, of religion and especially of the Christian religion, it must be recalled that, in Tsarist Russia, Christianity was at its worst.

'The village priesthood taken as a whole was illiterate and grasping.

'Throughout the vast Eurasian continent indigenous pagan magic and incantations held their own amid the Christian rites and such Christian doctrine as the peasant was taught.'

It is scarcely to be wondered that, after reading a plain objective and not unsympathetic account of Russian religion, the Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of London declared in 1934 that

'he could only come to one conclusion, and it is a conclusion that all true friends of religion will share: nearly all that religion has been and has meant to Russia ought to perish for ever from the face of the earth and from the memory of men.'

The anti-God movement was the surest way of ridding the country of the worst form of religious oppression, and in its spirit was not anti-Christian. The problem of freedom, or the loss of it under the Bolshevist *régime,* is a difficult one. The most practical form of freedom is equality of opportunity to every individual, and this the Bolshevist system seeks to give.

Professor Tawney is quoted (from *Equality,* p. 139) to show that the Soviets offer more real freedom than is obtained in other capitalist nations,

'except in a sense which is purely formal equality of opportunity is not merely a matter of legal equality. Its existence depends not merely on the absence of disabilities, but on the presence of abilities. It obtains in so far as, and only in so far as, each member of a community, whatever his birth, or occupation, or social position, possesses in fact, and not merely in form, equal chances of using to the full his natural endowments of physique, of character, and of intelligence. In proportion as the capacities of some are sterilised or stunted by their social environment, while those of others are favoured or pampered by it, equality of opportunity becomes a graceful but attenuated figment. It recedes from the world of reality to that of perorations.'

H. J. Palmer, *Hon. Canon of Ripon.*

Sir, THE INTERPRETATION OF Mt. xi, 12 (*cf.* Lk. xvi, 16).

Does not the word *βιάζεται* in Mt. xi, 12, both in Classical Greek and in the *Koine* mean not 'suffers violence' (*Gewalt leidet*), but 'demands an act of force,' of self-sacrifice, so that the sentence would run: 'The Kingdom of Heaven requires force of will, and men of force capture it,' like my disciple Simon Zelotes, once a revolutionary?

Chichester. C.G.W.

Of course, this is a permissible interpretation of this difficult passage, particularly as Judas, the traitor, was probably a Zealot (Iscariot may be a transliteration of *Sicarius*).—Ed., *M.C.*

Corrigendum.

The letter in the March issue on *Suicide and Euthanasia* was compressed, but we regret without any indication that this was so.—Ed., *M.C.*